

**THE RELATIONS OF DELHI SULTANATE
WITH RAJASTHAN
1206 — 1526**

T.1298

**A Thesis submitted in the
Department of History
Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Supervisor :

PROF. IRFAN HABIB

By :

M. S. AHLUWALIA

1972

A_B_S_T_R_A_C_T

The study of the political history of Rajasthan during the period of the Delhi Sultanate has been undertaken primarily because so far no connected account of this phase of Rajasthan history exists. Although a number of monographs on the history of the various clan dynasties such as the Chauhan, Rathors, Paramaras etc., have been written, yet no connected account of Rajasthan as a whole exists and no attempt has so far been made to correlate the information derived from the Sanskrit, Persian and Rajasthani literary and epigraphic sources so far available.

An attempt has been made in this thesis to utilise the source material available in the two main languages and to fill the gap in the researches so far published and thus to present a connected account of the political history of Rajasthan during the period under review.

The source material for the present study may be classified into epigraphic, Persian and non-Persian. A study of the available Muslim inscriptions throw new and interesting light on the process of the penetration and recession of the Delhi Sultan's authority in Rajasthan. A number of Persian inscriptions found mostly at places like, Sadadi, Pandukha, Mandor and Ladnu, are indicative of the fact that the north eastern parts of Marwar region acknowledged the central authority whereas the south-eastern region probably remained

uneffected by the Sultanate's influence. Epigraphic evidence now available further lends support to the fall of important fort towns of early medieval Rajasthan, such as Bayana, Jalor, Ajmer, Mandor, Chittor etc. Again, a Persian inscription of A.H. 709 establishes it beyond doubt that Chittor was under the effective control of the Khalji Sultans and thus refutes the hitherto believed bardic account of Rana Maldeo's hold over Chittor. Similarly, a set of Sanskrit inscriptions eulogising the Sultans or their opponents, offer some direct evidence of the nature of the political control over the area of the find-spot of the inscriptions. The other Sanskrit inscriptions have not only helped in knowing or constructing the history of the various Rajput clans, but also establish that a number of regions particularly the south-western and the south-eastern parts of Rajasthan, remained independent of the Muslim influence. In one particular case at least, the Sanskrit inscriptions have helped us in knowing the Khalji attack on Jaisalmer, which otherwise is not mentioned in the Persian chronicles. The inscriptions, however, have more corroborative value than adding substantially to the already available information, for which we have to depend mostly on Persian, Sanskrit and Rajasthani contemporary and later sources.

An attempt has been made in the present study to correlate and utilise the information gathered from the available Persian chronicles, notably, Tajul-Maasir, Tabaqat-i-

Nasiri, Barani and Afif's Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi, Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afaghina, Tarikh-i-Mubarekshahi, Amir Khusrau's historical Masnavis and Babur Nama etc., apart from a number of sources written during the Mughal period. Information from the contemporary and the later Sanskrit sources, such as , Prithvirajavijaykavya, Hammiramahakavya, Vividhatirthkalpa, Khartaragachchhapatavali, Puratanaprabandha-sangraha, Prabandha-cintamani and Prabandhakosa etc., has been correlated with the available Persian sources and many Rajasthani sources, including Khyats, Chaupais, Chhands and Rasos.

In the beginning of the thesis, apart from the evaluation of the above source-material, the geographical and political divisions of Rajasthan, the impact of physiography on the history of Rajasthan, the rise of the various clans in Rajasthan during the pre-Sultanate period, such as the Gurjara-Pratiharas, Chauhans, Guhilas, Bhatias, Rastrakutas etc., which held the various parts of Rajasthan, has also been attempted. An attempt has also been made for the first time to discuss briefly the system of political organisation of the so-called Rajput clans and the emergence of distinct categories of autonomous or semi-autonomous feudal chiefs going under the names, such as, Rajaputra, Ranaka, Rauta, Thakkura, Khuts, Muqaddams and Chaudharies etc., some of which titles were original whereas the others were evolved to suit the needs of the time.

The study of the political history during the period under review reveals that the Turkish invasion of northern India

was a long process bringing about important socio-political changes in Rajasthan. Although the region played an important role at the close of the twelfth century, it did not acquire a political identity during the period of the Sultans of Delhi.

A number of 'Rajput' clans which emerged before the period of the Sultans of Delhi, ended their political career even before the Ghorian occupation of Delhi. Some of these were liquidated by the Turkish and the Khalji Sultans of Delhi. Some of them, however, taking advantage of the political conditions of the post-Timur period reasserted their independence and continued to play an important role in the region for a considerable period.

Politically, the Ghorian invasion of northern India directly resulted in a feverish military activity amongst these clan chiefs. The Delhi Sultan's pressure on Rajasthan continued in various degrees during the entire period under review. A number of Sultans, particularly, Qutbuddin Aibak, Iltutmish, Balban, Alauddin Khalji succeeded in reducing Rajasthan principalities, such as Ajmer, Ranthambhor, Chittor, Jalor, Jaisalmer and Bayana, thus annexing important 'Rajput' ruling houses like the Chauhans, Guhilas, Bhatias, Rathors and the Paramaras.

The period under study, however, witnessed the rise of a number of new ruling houses in Rajasthan such as Bundi, Marwar, Ranthambhor and Bayana. In the last principality, the Jadon Bhatias were replaced by the Auhadi and the Khanzada chiefs, who continued to rule over the region in semi-independent capacity till the coming of the Mughals. Some other principalities, such

as Chittor, which had earlier been annexed to the Sultanate during the Khalji period, re-asserted independence. It also becomes clear from the contemporary accounts that not only the Muslim chiefs, mostly posted in eastern Rajasthan, but also the Rajput chiefs in distant areas such as Mewar, declared independence. Whereas the Khanzada chiefs of Mewat (which included the modern districts of Alwar and Bharatpur) remained a source of constant trouble and seditious activities during Balban's period and again during the Saiyyid and Lodi Sultans, the Mewar rulers, particularly, Rana Hammira, Kumbha and Rana Sanga, not only succeeded in regaining their lost territories, but also in extending their territories at the cost of the Sultans of Delhi. The Saiyyid and the Lodi Sultans failed to curb their growing power. But the latter succeeded in consolidating their position by forming a Rajput confederacy, on the one hand, and the Rajput - Mughal alliance, on the other, in a bid to claim supremacy. This reduced the Delhi Sultanate drastically and left the field open to Babur, who finally succeeded in defeating and killing both the serious rivals to sovereignty and thus establishing his own empire.

The socio-political structure did not undergo a substantial change during this period. Yet there are several instances when the Sultans took the Rajputs in confidence and left the conquered territories like Ajmer and Ranthambhor etc., in their possession and also appointed them to some high posts. The Jain monks of Rajasthan, similarly, are reported during the Tughluq period to have eulogised the Sultans and secured liberal

concessions from them for pilgrimage and propagating their religion. This is clearly indicated on the basis of a few literary sources such as Khartaragachchhapatavali and inscriptions, such as, the Ranakpur Jain temple inscription of V.S. 1496/1440 A.D. A number of Jain monks like Samar Singh, Mahendra Suri, Somprabha Suri and scholars like Rajasekhra and Jinprabha Suri enjoyed royal patronage, as is evident from Jain chronicles like, Vividhatirthakalpa, Kathakosa, Prabandhasintamani and Prabandhakosa etc. It seems certain from these and the other sources that some of the Jain monks and scholars were held in high esteem at the royal court and as such they succeeded in securing certain concessions for the Jain community through the favour of the Sultans.

A large number of Sanskrit inscriptions too speak highly about the Tughluq Sultans and their liberal appointments of the Hindus to the key posts, such as Vazir. Some of the willing or forcible conversions of the important Rajput clans, such as, the Bhatias, Kyam Khani Chauhans and the Khanzada chiefs of Mewat, are known on the basis of literary and epigraphic evidence during this period. Probably, these 'secular' elements were the forerunners of the ones that came into existence in the Mughal empire.

C_O_N_T_E_N_T_S

Preface		1 - 11
Acknowledgement		iii - iv
Abbreviations		v - vii
<u>CHAPTER I</u>	'Introduction'	1 - 72
	A. Sources;)
	B. Rajasthan: The Geographical background and political divisions;)
	C. Rise of various clans in Rajasthan during the pre-Sultanate period;)
	D. The Rajput ruling order.)
<u>CHAPTER II</u>	The Ghorian Conquest of Rajasthan.	73 - 91
<u>CHAPTER III</u>	Iltutmish's operations in Rajasthan.	92 - 115
<u>CHAPTER IV</u>	Successors of Iltutmish	116 - 136
<u>CHAPTER V</u>	Jalalud-Din Firuz Khalji and Rajasthan.	137 - 144
<u>CHAPTER VI</u>	Khalji Imperialism	145 - 206
<u>CHAPTER VII</u>	The New Kingdoms of Bundi and Marwar	207 - 218
<u>CHAPTER VIII</u>	The Barwars	219 - 227

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>IX</u>	Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq.	228 - 238
<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>X</u>	Rajasthan under Muhammad Tughluq.	239 - 251
<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>XI</u>	Sultan Firus Tughluq.	252 - 268
<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>XII</u>	The Saiyyids & Mewat	269 - 295
<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>XIII</u>	Lodis and Rajasthan.	296 - 324
<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>XIV</u>	Conclusion	325 - 327
APPENDIX		A: List of Persian Inscriptions	
		B: List of Sanskrit Inscriptions (containing Muslim references)	
BIBLIOGRAPHY			354 - 365
MAP			366

P_R_E_F_A_C_E

This study of the political history of Rajasthan during the period of the Delhi Sultanate has been undertaken primarily because so far no connected account exists of this phase of Rajasthan history.

Much has indeed been written on the history of the various clans, such as the Chauhans, Rathors, Paramaras etc., but first, these various clan-histories have not been correlated to give a coherent picture of developments in Rajasthan as a whole; and, secondly, there has been no attempt to correlate information derived from the Sanskrit and Rajasthani epigraphic and literary sources with the rich source material represented by the Persian chronicles. In the scholarly works written on the Delhi Sultanate, Rajasthan usually forms a half-hidden corner on the canvass, and the extension of the Sultans' authority in Rajasthan usually elicits little more than casual references.

This thesis is a modest attempt to fill the gap in the researches so far published. An attempt has been made to utilise the sources in the two main languages, Persian and Sanskrit, as well as Rajasthani, in the original, and

critically collate and evaluate their evidence, in order to reconstruct the political history of Rajasthan during our period. Persian (and Arabic) inscriptions found in Rajasthan have been carefully studied, and their evidence utilised to a very full extent perhaps for the first time.

It is hoped that the reconstruction of the political history of Rajasthan from the end of the twelfth to the beginning of the sixteenth century will throw some new and interesting light on the process of the penetration and recession of the Sultans' authority in Rajasthan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In writing this thesis, I owe very much to my Supervisor, Professor Irfan Habib; and I am extremely grateful to him for the interest shown in my work and the encouragement he gave me.

Professor S. Nurul Hasan, in his capacity as the Head of the Department, has always evinced considerable interest in my work, and guided me on certain points.

I should also mention here that the research on this work was commenced at Delhi under the late Professor K.M.Ashraf, who had suggested to me this topic, and guided me until his premature demise. Thereafter, I received valuable help and guidance from Dr. Dashratha Sharma for some time. I am also obliged to Professor Fauja Singh, Head of the Department of History, Punjabi University, Patiala for taking keen interest in the progress of my work.

I have worked in the following libraries and research institutions for my research: Maulana Azad Library Aligarh; Seminar Library, History Department, Aligarh; Rajasthan University Library, Jaipur; Sumer Public

Library, Jodhpur; Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur; Bhartiya Vidya Mandir Shodh Pratishthan, Bikaner; Rajasthan Shodh Sansthan, Jodhpur; Personal Collection of Dr. Ganda Singh, Patiala; Central Archaeological Library, New Delhi; Naziria Library, Delhi; Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner. I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to the authorities and staff of the above libraries and institutions for allowing me access to the valuable records and books bearing on my subject.

I must express my thanks to the University Grants Commission for granting me a fellowship to pursue the research. Thanks are also due to Shri S.S.Rana for preparing map. and Shri R.K.Gupta for typing the manuscript.

M.S. AHLUWALIA

ALIGARH,
August, 1972.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.A.	<u>Ain-i-Akbari</u>
A.N.	<u>Akbar Nama</u>
Annals	<u>Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan</u>
A.R.I.E.	<u>Annual Report of Indian Epigraphy</u>
A.R.R.M.	<u>Annual Report Rajputana Museum</u>
A.S.I.	<u>Archaeological Survey of India Report</u>
B.G.	<u>Bombay Gazetteer</u>
B.I.	<u>Bhavnagar Inscriptions</u>
B.N.	<u>Babur Nama</u>
Briggs	<u>Tarikh-i-Ferishta (tr.)</u>
C.M.J.B.	<u>Catalogue of Hss in Jaisalmer Bhandars</u>
D.H.N.I.	<u>Dynastic History of Northern India</u>
D.R.I.	<u>Dungarpur Rajya ka Itihas</u>
E.C.D.	<u>Early Chauhan Dynasties</u>
E. and D.	<u>Elliott and Dowson's, History of India as told by its own Historians.</u>
E.I.	<u>Epigraphia Indica</u>
E.I.M.	<u>Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica</u>
E.I.A.P.S.	<u>Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement</u>

P.S.	<u>Futuhus - Salatin</u>
H.M.K.	<u>Hammiramahakavya</u>
I.A.	<u>Indian Antiquary</u>
I.A.A.R.	<u>Indian Archaeology - A Review</u>
J.A.S.B.	<u>Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal</u>
J.I.H.	<u>Journal of Indian History</u>
J.L.S.	<u>Jaina Lekha Sangrah</u>
J.R.A.S.	<u>Journal of Royal Asiatic Society</u>
K.F.	<u>Khazain-ul-Futuh</u>
K.P.	<u>Kanhadadeprabandha</u>
List	<u>Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions of Northern India</u>
M.A.	<u>Makhzan-i-Afghana</u>
M.F.	<u>Miftahul-Futuh</u>
M.R.	<u>Maasir-i-Rahimi</u>
M.T.	<u>Muntakhab-ut-Tavarikh</u>
N.K.	<u>Nainsi Khyat</u>
P.I.H.C.	<u>Proceedings of Indian History Congress</u>
P.K.	<u>Prabandha Kosa</u>
P.R. (W.C.)	<u>Progress Report of Archaeological Survey of India (Western Circle)</u>

T.A.	<u>Tabaqat-i-Akbari</u>
T.D.	<u>Tarikh-i-Daudi</u>
T.F.	<u>Tarikh-i-Ferishta</u>
T.F.S.	<u>Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi</u> (Barani)
T.Fr.Sh.	<u>Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi</u> (Afif)
T.M.	<u>Tajul-Maasir</u>
T.M.S.	<u>Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi</u>
T.N.	<u>Tabaqat-i-Nasiri</u>
Tugh.N.	<u>Tughluq Nama</u>
T.S.A.	<u>Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afgh^aina</u>
U.R.I.	<u>Udaipur Rajya ka Itihas</u>
W.M.	<u>Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi</u>

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

A. SOURCES

Broadly speaking, the sources for the study of the relations of Delhi Sultanate with Rajasthan may be classified into epigraphic, Persian and non-Persian sources.

Inscriptions:

For the period under review, a large number of inscriptions, throwing significant light on the expansion of the Sultans' authority in Rajasthan have been found. The inscriptions are in two main groups Persian and Arabic; and Sanskrit. The Persian and Arabic inscriptions number about 140.

From fourteen Persian inscriptions, found at places like Bharatpur, Ajmer, Dildwana, Ladnu, Nagaur, etc., it becomes obvious that Muslim influence extended from Bharatpur to Nagaur in Jodhpur during the thirteenth century. The name of the first governor of Nagaur is known only from epigraphic evidence. In Marwar region, a number of inscriptions found mostly at places like Sadadi, Pandukha, Mandor and Ladnu, are indicative of the fact that the north-eastern parts of Marwar acknowledged the central authority. Nevertheless, the south-eastern region appears to have remained unaffected by the Sultanate's influence.

Again a close study of the Persian inscription so far available shows that regions like Bayana, Jalor, Mandor and Mewar witnessed a fall during the Khalji period. Yet another inscription of A.H. 709/1310 A.D. referring to Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji and Prince Khizr Khan, refutes the hitherto believed story of Maldeo's hold over Chittor. On the basis of this inscription, it is now established that Chittor was effectively under the control of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji up to at least 1310 A.D.

The Sanskrit inscriptions may be considered in two categories. The first category comprises of those inscriptions which either eulogise the Sultans or their opponents, and thus offer some direct evidence of the nature of the political control over the area of the find-spots. The other category consists of those inscriptions which contain no direct references, favourable or hostile, to the Sultans. Such inscriptions are still valuable from the point of view of clan-geneologies, and other aspects of political history.

The Sanskrit inscriptions not only help us in knowing the geneology and reconstructing the history of the various Rajput clans, but also establish that regions like Mt. Abu, Bhinmal, Kota, Udaipur, Sirohi, Dungarpur, Jaipur and Jaisalmer etc., practically remained independent of Muslim influence. In some of the cases, the Sanskrit inscriptions

give us new facts regarding the Sultans' military operations. The Khalji attack on Jaisalmer for instance, otherwise not recorded in the contemporary Persian chronicles, is known on the basis of Sanskrit inscriptions. A list of all inscriptions which eulogise the Sultans or their opponents, is given in the appendix at the end of the thesis.

Persian Sources:

The inscriptions, however, have more of corroborative value than adding substantially to the already available information, for which we have to depend on the contemporary and later Persian sources.

The Tajul-Maasir of Hasan Nizami is a reliable and contemporary work describing the political history of the period 1193-1217. It has proved a good source for the closing years of Prithviraja III's reign, Hariraja's attempt to revive the Chauhan power and Sultan Iltutmish's attack on Udaya Sinha. The work commenced in 1200 A.D., opens with the transactions of the year 1191 when Shihabud-Din of Ghor undertook to avenge the disaster he had met in the first battle of Tarain. The account of this critical period is carried down to 1217 although in some of its copies the account is carried down to even twelve years later, or

1228-29 A.D. Although poor in historical details, the Tajul-Maasir has proved very useful with regard to Shihabud-Din and Qutbud-Din's campaigns against the chiefs of Rajasthan. About the achievements of Aibak, Hasan Nizami writes, '(Aibak) had taken away every fort and stronghold which he attacked ... He had made the heads of the crown Raja crown the top of impaling posts, had sent the whole world of idolatry to the fire of hell ...' . It is from Tajul-Maasir again that we know about Ajmer after its conquest as being made headquarters for further operations in Rajasthan and also that Prithviraja's son was given Ranthambhor and allowed to rule after his accepting the Turkish suzerainty. The work also furnishes interesting details about the rebellions of Hariraja - the dissatisfied brother of Prithviraja and Jatwan - the Chauhan Commander, both of whom tried to revive the Chauhan power in Ajmer and its dependencies but failed. Similarly the details of the conquest of Jalor by Sultan Iltutmish are also given. There are clear hints in the work that during the initial phase of conquest in Rajasthan, the Turkish conquerors did not intend to follow the policy of direct annexation. Both in the case of Ajmer and Jalor, the territories were left with the local ruling chiefs. The Tajul-Maasir is not printed. The manuscript used in the thesis belongs to late Professor Mohammad Habib. For some campaigns of Sultan

Iltutmish, however, Elliot and Dowson's translation is used.

The victories of Qutbud-Din Aibak and his master Shihabud-Din are also contained in Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah. Although written in the middle of the fifteenth century, the work provides valuable and dated account of the early years of Turkish expansion.

One of the best and well known histories of the period is Tabaqat-i-Nasiri of Minhajud-Din Siraj. The work carries the account upto the year 1260 - the year of its completion. The account of the period from the beginning of the rule of Sultan Iltutmish up to the fifteenth year of the accession of Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud is based on the author's own observations.

Minhaj's history is an important source and forms the basis for the study of early Muslim expansion in Rajasthan. The author gives details about the defeat of Prithviraja Chauhan and the subsequent history of princely state of Ajmer. The Turkish conquests of the places like Bayana, Ranthambhor and Mewat are also narrated in detail. Reference is also made to a number of Iqtas held by Muizzi and Shamsi Maliks in Rajasthan. Being an orthodox Muslim, Minhaj usually held the Hindu chiefs with contempt.

The account left by Minhaj is continued in Ziaud-Din Barani's famous Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi. The work completed in A.H. 758/1357 A.D. and dedicated to Sultan Firuz Tughluq, serves as a unique source for the period from the first year of Balban's rule onwards. Much of the work, compiled by Barani in his old age and without notes, is anecdotal in character and does not sometimes follow the chronological sequence of events. It, however, offers much insight into the political history of the Khalji and Tughluq periods and is much quoted by the subsequent authors. The author did not live to complete the account of Sultan Firuz Tughluq. Barani's narration of the events of Rajasthan too, are very limited and biased. His description of the battles and campaigns in Rajasthan during the Khalji period, although based on personal information, is not free from errors. He dismisses the account of the conquest of Chittor, for example, in just one sentence. The account of the conquest of Sivana and Ranthambhor is, however, given in some details, although no date is given for any of the events.

Among the historical prose works and Masnawis of Amir Khusrau, the Khazain-ul-Futuh has been found very useful for Sultan Alaud-Din's campaigns in Rajasthan, particularly the conquest and annexation of the Guhila stronghold of Chittor and Chauhan kingdoms of Ranthambhor,

Chhain (often read as Jhain), Jalor and Siwana. The work completed in A.H. 711/1311-12 A.D. contains valuable information about the political developments in Rajasthan during the first decade of the fourteenth century.

Amir Khusrau's information stands above others, for the poet historian was not only contemporary with the events which he describes, but also was a participant in many of them.

Among the other works of Amir Khusrau, Miftah-ul-Futuh (690/1291 A.D.), Deval Rani Khizr Khan (C.716/1316 A.D.) and Tughluq Nama (C. 720/1320 A.D.) are also useful since these refer to some of the events connected with the political history of Rajasthan. The Miftah-ul-Futuh for instance, gives a detailed account of Sultan Jalalud-Din Khalji's attack on the fortress of Chhain and Ranthambhor in 1291 A.D. The reference to Sahni, the commander of Rana Hammira, is corroborated by the Chauhan biographies of Hammira. There is also a brief reference to the invasion of Chittor and Siwana and detailed reference to Rai Karan, the chief of Gujarat and Deval Rani the daughter of the Baghela chief who was married to prince Khizr Khan son of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji. The Tughluq Nama too refers briefly to the bravery exhibited by Ghazi Malik (future Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq) during Jalalud-Din Khalji's siege of Ranthambhor.

The Futuh-us-Salatin of Isami occupies a prominent place among the primary sources for the political history up to the middle of the fourteenth century. The author, who was a contemporary of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq, wrote his work in verse. His family was intimately connected with the Sultans since the days of Sultan Iltutmish. Although the work is replete with anecdotes and the author is particularly prejudiced against Sultan Muhammad Tughluq, the work is extremely useful for several campaigns of the Delhi Sultans in Rajasthan during the pre-Tughluq period.

The graphic details of the capture of the fortress of Ranthambhor by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, as given by Isami, tally with the non-Persian sources. Isami even mentions the names of the Muslim mutineers who took shelter with Rana Hammira at Ranthambhor. Some useful information about the conquest of Siwana and Gujarat during the Khalji period is also available from the Isami's work.

Barani's history closes at the sixty year of Sultan Firuz Tughluq's reign and the account is continued by Shams Siraj Afif, our next contemporary authority for the Tughluq period. Afif's work is equally useful for the political history of the Tughluq period. But there is very little in Afif relating to Rajasthan.

The history of the post-Timur period Rajasthan is known from Yahya bin Ahmad bin Abdullah Sirhindi's work Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi. The book completed in 1434 occupies a very important place among the contemporary histories of the period particularly relating to the Saiyyid dynasty. Yahya Sirhindi, a contemporary of Saiyyid Sultan Mubarak Shah, has left a detailed account of the military activities of the Saiyyid Sultans. It appears that Yahya Sirhindi based his information for the early period up to the time of the accession of Sultan Firuz Tughluq, on 'various histories'; from and after that period, he wrote from 'trustworthy information and personal observation'. About his own position and connections, however, Yahya Sirhindi is quite silent. As the title of the work indicates, the book was dedicated to Sultan Mubarak Shah. Yahya Sirhindi's work is a correct and honest account and our original authority for the post-Timur period of thirty five years (1400-1434 A.D.).

For the Lodi period, a number of Persian sources have been utilized such as the Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi (A.H.989/1581 A.D.), the Tarikh-i-Khan-i-Jahan, later known as the Makhzan-i-Afghani, Tarikh-i-Daudi (Jahangir's period), Tarikh-i-Shahi (C. 1601 A.D.) also known as Tarikh-i-Salat-i-Afaghina (C. 1613 A.D.).

Niamatullah's Makhzan-i-Afghani completed in A.H. 1021/1613 A.D. has been found a valuable source for the Lodi activities in Rajasthan. It is from this work that we know about Sikandar Lodi's wars with the various Rajput dynasties.

Although the Lodi ruler's operations against the Hindu Raja's during this period was confined to the Hindu chieftains of the Doab and Central India, it gives a good deal of idea about Lodi attitude towards the Hindus in general and the Tomara Rajputs in particular. Similarly the Tarikh-i-Shahi, otherwise known as Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afaghina, is the only chronicle referring to Sultan Bahlul Lodi's campaign against the Sisodia Rana of Mewar, it thus corroborates the traditional Rajput accounts as preserved in the Tod's Annals and anti-
quities of Rajasthan.

Non-Persian Sources:

Unfortunately in most of the cases, contemporary non-Persian evidence is lacking. Whatever is known about the Rajput side of the story, is based on the works compiled much longer after the actual event. Leaving aside some of the contemporary Chauhan sources, all others were written several centuries afterwards.

Among the Sanskrit works, Jayanaka's Prithviraja-vijaya occupies an important place. The Kavya is a contemporary source dealing with, as the title indicates, Prithviraja's victories. It was certainly written during the close of twelfth century for it is referred to in the works of Jayaratha, a Kashmiri author of about 1200 A.D. There are several references to Prithviraja's hostile attitude towards the Turks and about his mission of destroying the Mlechchhas. The work seems to have been completed before 1193 A.D. (the year of the final defeat of Prithviraja), since there is no reference to Prithviraja's final defeat and death at the hands of Shihabud-Din.

A very useful account of the Chauhan chief of Ranthambhor is Nayachandra Suris' Hammiramahakavya. It was written in the fourteenth century, and records the achievements of the Chauhans of the Ranthambhor line up to the final defeat of Rana Hammira and the annexation of the kingdom.

From the details left by Nayachandra Suri, it appears that he had access to many earlier sources. It is mostly written in a formal style. Nevertheless, it supplements the information supplied by the Muslim chroniclers in a number of places and also refers to the vicissitudes of the Muslim hold over Ranthambhor.

The account of the Chauhan chiefs is continued in another sixteenth century Sanskrit work Surjanacharita of Chandrasekhara. Although written as late as Akbar's reign, it has been found useful as a supplementary source.

Jayasimha Suri's Hammiramadamardana is another Sanskrit work dealing with the defeat of the forces of Hammira Milachohhikara (probably Sultan Iltutmish) by the forces of Viradhavala Baghela, assisted by Udaya Simha Chauhan of Jalor and his allies. Yet another work dealing with the history of the Sonigara Chauhans is Jinaprabha Suri's Vividhatirthakalpa. The writer who was a contemporary of Sultan Muhammad Bin Tughluq, gives useful information about Sultan Alaud-Din's conquest of Gujarat, during the course of which he encountered the Chauhans and sacked several Sonigara strongholds like Bahadmer, Sanchor and Bhinnal.

For the Khalji penetration into Rajasthan, the Kharataragachohhapattavali of Jinapala completed in V.S. 1393/1337 A.D., is extremely useful. It consists of three parts of which the second and third parts are dated.

Among the other Sanskrit works, Puratanaprabandhasan-graha (C. V.S. 1290/1234 A.D.), Merutunga's Prabandhasintamani (C. V.S. 1361/1305 A.D.) and Rajasekhara's Prabandhakosa (C. V.S. 1405/1349 A.D.) too are useful in supplementing

our information about medieval Rajasthan. The Puratana-prabandhasangraha and Prabandhasintamani refer to some of the events of Prithviraja's reign. The Prabandhakosa, though it is mainly a source for the history of Gujarat, also deals with the early Chauhan rulers of Nadol, Jalor, Sambhar and Ranthambhor. Some of its copies also contain the geneology of the last two Chauhan houses. Apart from the above mentioned works, Sukrtakirtikalolini of Udaya-prabha Suri also contains some useful material on Chauhan ruler Udaya Simha of Jalor.

Rajasthani and Hindi accounts:

Apart from the important Sanskrit works mentioned above, a large number of Rajasthani and Hindi works (mostly semi-historical and bardic literature) are also available. The Kanhadadeprabandha (C. V.S. 1512/1456 A.D.) of Padma nabha is a detailed biography of Kanhadadeva, the Chauhan chief of Jalor. Written in western Rajasthani style in the middle of the fifteenth century, it furnishes historical as well as traditional account of Rao Kanhadadeva's rise and fall. The portion dealing with Kanhadadeva's fight with Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji is fairly accurate and detailed one and supplements our information regarding the fall of the two important Chauhan kingdoms of Jalor and Siwana during the Khalji rule.

A large number of Hindi and Rajasthani poems dealing with the life of Rana Hammira, the Chauhan chief of Ranthambhor are also available. Although written at a much later date and having limited historical value, some of these Chaupais, Rasos and Chhandas such as Hammirayan of Bhandav Vyas (C. V.S. 1538/1481 A.D.), Hammiraraso of Jodharaja (V.S. 1885), Hammirahatha (V.S. 1902) of Chandrasekhara, Hammira ra Chanda of Rajarupa (V.S. 1798) and many others supplement our material for the career of Rana Hammira. Similarly the Prakritapingalam and Sarangadharapaddhati and Vidyapati's Purusapariksa (Sanskrit) also contain stray notices about Hammira.

Among the Khyat literature, Nainsi Khyat occupies a prominent place. Written about the middle of the seventeenth century, it supplies very useful and exhaustive account of the various Rajput clans of medieval Rajasthan from the tenth to the seventeenth century. Although many dates given by Nainsi are incorrect, its geneological and dynastic information about almost all the medieval ruling houses in Rajasthan, is very useful in supplying the missing gaps in the Persian chronicles.

Among the other bardic literature, reference may also be made to the Dyal Dass Khyat, Bankidas Khyat, Kyan Khan Raso of Jan, (for the history of the Qawan Khani's of

Fatehpur Rajasthan), Dalpat Vilas (for the geneology of the Rathors of Marwar), Ekalinga-Mahatmya (Sanskrit) of Kanna Vyas (for the geneology of the Mewar house up to Rana Kumbha), etc., all of which furnish historical facts as represented in popular tradition.

Among the secondary works used, reference may also be made to Shymal Das's Vir-Vinod, Tod's Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, G.H.Ojha's Rajputana Ka Itihas, H.C.Ray's Dynastic History of Northern India, B.N.Reu's Marwar Ka Itihas, and Dashratha Sharma's Early Chauhan Dynasties, Rajasthan through the Ages and Lectures on Rajput History and Culture.

B: RAJASTHAN: THE GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND AND POLITICAL DIVISIONS

Rajasthan¹ as it stands today, is a large state in the western part of India. Its present name, as also the one adopted officially during British rule, 'Rajputana', became popular because a majority of the different clans

1. Rajasthan literally means Regal abode. (Raj: Regal and Sthan: abode). The first reference to Rajasthan occurs in an inscription of V.S. 1765/1708 A.D. now in Sardar Museum Jodhpur (cited in G.N. Sharma, Social Life in Medieval Rajasthan, p. 1, fn. 1). In local Rajasthani dialect the region is also called Rajwara and Raethana. Tod. Annals, Vol. I, p. 1.

who ruled over it, have claimed for themselves the title of Rajputs. Both the names are, however, of recent origin and it is difficult to say by what name the region was called before the British began using these two names at the beginning of the nineteenth century.¹

Rajasthan is situated between 23⁰.3 to 30.12 degrees of latitude and 69.30 to 78.17 longitude and occupies an area of 3,42,274 kilometers.² On its north-east are the states of Panjab and Haryana, to its east and south-east Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, and to its south-west Gujarat. The rest of the boundary on the western and northern side marches with West Pakistan. This last is an international boundary, about 1,070 kilometers long, and it separates the Rajasthan district of Ganganagar, Bikaner, Jaisalmer and Barmar from the districts of Bhawalpur, Khairpur and Mirpur Khas in Pakistan.

Before 1947 Rajasthan contained twenty-one princely states, two independent Thikanas (Jagirs) and the British territory of Ajmer-Merwara.³ The principal states were

-
1. Franklin William, Military Memoirs of George Thomas, p. 347 (cited in G.S. Guhilot, Rajputana ka Itihas, p. 1).
 2. Census of India, 1961, Vol. I, part 11 (A), p. 87.
 3. The present state of Rajasthan is the product of successive mergers of no less than 19 princely states and three chiefships, commencing from 17 March 1948 to 1956, with the promulgation of the States Reorganisation Act.

Udaipur, Dungarpur, Banswara, Pratapgarh and Shahpura, (under Guhilots, Sisodias); Bundi Kota and Sirohi (under the Chauhans); Karauli and Jaisalmer (under Yadavas); Jaipur and Alwar (under Kachhwahas); Jodhpur, Bikaner and Kishangarh (under Rathors); Jhalawar (under Jhala Rajputs); Danta (under Paramaras); Bharatpur and Dholpur (under Jats); and Tonk (under Muslim Chiefs).

Most of the principalities mentioned above, have been known by different names; and except for Udaipur, Bundi Kota, Sirohi, Jaisalmer and Jodhpur, most of the other kingdoms were founded at a date much later than the period with which we are concerned. Some kingdoms like Ranthambhor, Jalor, Nadol etc., saw their rise and fall during the period of our study, while the other states were known by their older territorial names¹ and parts of these

-
1. Epigraphic and literary records of early medieval Rajasthan, mention the following ancient names for various principalities:

Mewar;	<u>Medapat.</u> Adivaraha Temple inscription, Ahar, V.S. 1000/943 A.D., now in M.B. College, Udaipur.
Jaisalmer;	<u>Mada.</u> Ghatiyala Inscription of 22nd bright half of <u>Chaitra</u> , V.S. 919/8th March, 862 A.D., <u>J.R.A.S.</u> 1895, pp. 517-18.
Jodhpur;	<u>Maru.</u> Gosundi Inscription of 1504 A.D., <u>J.A.S.R.</u> , Vol. 55, part 1, No.2, p. 80 verse 4 and Morkana Inscription of V.S. 1573/1516 A.D., <u>Ibid.</u> , Vol. XIII, pp. 214-15.

territories frequently changed hands between one or the other powerful Rajput clans.

Contd...

- Bikaner; Jangaldesh. Chirawa Inscription of V.S. 1330/1273 A.D. Ibid., Vol. XXVII, pp. 285-292 and Chhand Rao Jaisi, verse 38.
- Ajmer; Ajaymeru. Prithvirajavijaykavya, Canto VIII.
- Nagaur; Ahichhatrapura. Bijolym Inscription of V.S. 1226/1170 A.D. Verse, 12, E.I., Vol. XXVI, pp. 90-106, Vol. XL, p. 28 and E.G., Vol. I, part 11, p. 560, fn.
- Sirohi; Arbuda. Achleshwara Inscription of V.S. 1342/1288 A.D. Verse 49. E.I., No. 6, p. 86 and E.I., Vol. XXV (April 1933), p. 60, line 12.
- Dungarpur; Vagad. Bheekrod Inscription of 3rd of the dark half of Pausha, V.S. 1291/9th January, 1234 A.D., G.H.Ojha, D.R.I., p. 2, fn.3 and Varvasa inscription of 15th of bright half of Ashadha, V.S. 1359/10th July, 1302 A.D., Ibid., p. 3, Babur Nama, tr. Beveridge, Vol. II, p. 573 and Nainsi N.K., Vol. I, pp. 570, 86.
- Jalpur; Dhundhar. Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi, tr. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. IV, p. 522 and Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, pp. 187, 293, 295 etc.
- Alwar and Bharatpur; Mewat. Minhaj T.N., Kabul, text., Vol. II, pp. 29, 58, 71.
- Bundi; Harsoti. Skalinga Mahatmaya, Verse, 103, Nainsi, N.K., p. 34.

PHYSIOGRAPHY

Rajasthan is divided into two distinct geographical divisions, namely the Great Plains lying on the west of the Aravallis known as the Western Sandy Plains and the Central High Lands, lying to the east of the Aravallis.

The Aravalli range in Rajasthan which runs from north-east to south-west, thus forms the dividing line between these two divisions. The range is considered to be the oldest folded range in the world.

The range may be said to have its focal point at Mt. Abu. It extends towards the south-western direction, so as to cover the districts of Jalor and Sanchor. It also runs towards the north of Marwar ending near Satalmer and Jaisalmer. From Mt. Abu again, the range tends north-east and runs to Ajmer beyond which its spurs continue deep into Mewat. This constitutes the main range.¹

1. The range though not of uniform width, runs diagonally across the states from the north-east near Delhi and extends to south-west to the plains of Gujarat, for a distance of about 692 kilometers. Within Rajasthan the range runs from Khetri (Jaipur) in the north-east to Khed Brahma (Sirohi) in the south-west for a length of about 550 kilometers. Some of the peaks on this range are Babai (730 mt.) Kho (920 mt.) Raghunathgarh (1055 Mts.) Taragarh (873 mts.) and Gurushikar (1,727 mts.) which is the highest. V.C.Misra, Geography of Rajasthan, pp. 1-2, For a description of the Gurushikar Peak, see R.C.Temple, The Travels of Peter Mundy, (London 1914), Vol. II, p. 257. For Physiography, see also Spate and Learmonth, India and Pakistan, pp. 617-621.

As for the two main divisions, the Western Sandy Plains include Marusthali, Bagar, Godwar tract and Shekhawati tract. The Marusthali covers Marwar and includes the districts of Bikaner, Jaisalmer, Churu, part of Western Nagaur and parts of Barmer and Jodhpur districts.¹

The eastern highlands are slightly less sharply marked than the western plains. They may broadly be said to contain two sub-divisions with rather indeterminate frontiers namely the Eastern Plains, constituting the Banas Basin and Chhappen Plains; and the plateau of South-Eastern Rajasthan, Pathar or Haraoti, which includes Kota Bundi.²

1. The area is known as the Great Desert and extends from larger portion of the Rann of Kutch to the southern border of Panjab and includes Jodhpur, Bikaner, and Jaisalmer. The entire tract is a sandy-waste. This is sub-divided into several regions. The Western most belt is covered by sand dunes; next to it is the rocky barmer, Jaisalmer, Bikaner tract. Further east to it lies the little Desert up to the north of Bikaner. Then comes the semi-arid region, where drainage is provided by the Luni river. Further to its north are the salt lakes of Didwana and Sambhar etc. V.C. Misra, op.cit., p. 24.

2. V.C. Misra, op.cit., pp. 22-23.

IMPACT OF ITS PHYSIOGRAPHY ON
THE HISTORY OF RAJASTHAN

The hills and the valleys of the Aravallis provided the means of survival not only to some of the tribes like Bhils¹ and Mers since time immemorial, but also made it possible for the local chiefs of various principalities to seek shelter in its rugged ravines and valleys. During the early phase of Muslim expansion in Rajasthan, the physical features of the region greatly helped the local chiefs in continuing the struggle for existence against heavy odds.²

The wars of Mewatis as well as those of the Chiefs of Mewat and Marwar, may be cited in this connection. The successors of Bahadur Nahr, Jallu and Kaddu, along with other Mewatis, laid waste their own territory and retained independence in the mountains of Andwar beyond the reach of

-
1. For a description of Bhils, see R.C.Temple, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 260.
 2. G.N.Sharma, Social History of Medieval Rajasthan, pp. 6-7.

the royal forces.¹

The great desert, likewise, bred tribes of wandering herdsmen. Like the Aravalli range, it too provided an easy refuge to the rebel chiefs. It is a matter of common knowledge that the region remained practically independent; and owing to shortage of water² and un-productiveness, there were frequent shifts of population.

However, inspite of its disadvantages, the fact that it lay astride the road to Gujarat and the busy sea ports of the western coast of India, Rajasthan could not easily be allowed to remain out of its control by the central power.

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text., p. 204.

سال دیگر سده تسع و عشرين و ثمانمائة باز سوت میوات سواری نمی‌مود. چگو و قد و نیمه‌ان بادر نایب
و بعض میوان که با ایشان پیوسته بودند مقامات خویش را خراب کرده در موه اند و رحای تشنه.

2. Koh Andwar 121103 has been identified as 'Indur', mentioned in Ain-i-Akbari as one of the mahals in Sarkar Tijara. Its fort is also mentioned therein. (tr., Vol. II, p. 192). The fort now is a ruined town in Alwar State and lies about ten miles east of Tijara. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, (Bombay, 1939), pp. 405.

2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 31. *हिंदू जामल मरे लाँ दाम २५ बाधे वाम*
जामल/दा - एम है - नह २५ है, मोहो जामल/दा - एम वाम है। नह दम है।
सु जामल/दा एम सु सिंदी, जामल/दा सिंदी एम सु। याम जामल/दा एम सु।
जामल/दा सिंदी एम सु। नह सु।
 Fazl, A.A., Vol. I, p. 182; Abbas Sarwani, Tarikh-i-
Sher Shahi, tr. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. IV, p. 408;
 R.C. Temple, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 251.

Thus the principalities of Merta, Jalor and Nagaur etc., were sought to be kept under their direct occupation by the Sultans of Delhi, while the Mughals too garrisoned these strongholds and out posts.¹

The Plateau, known in the epigraphs as 'Uparnal' or 'Uttamadri', extending from Chittor to Begun, Bijolijan Mandalgarh and then to Haraoti and Bundi, was extremely productive.² It also contained centres of pilgrimage and abodes of ascetics to the Hindu, Jains and the Sufis alike, thus holding an important position in the social and political life of the period.

This area appears from one view³ to form part of the Great Malwa Plateau, but actually it is raised above that by

-
1. Abul Fazl, A.A., Vol. II, pp. 276-77.
 2. The productivity of the area mainly depends on its drainage. The area is drained by the river Chambal and its right-bank tributaries like Kali, Sindh, Parvan and Parbati etc. The Ana Sagar at Ajmer gives rise to Luni river, which forms a significant water course flowing out of the area. (V.C. Misra, op.cit., pp. 37, 40). All kinds of food-stuff were grown in the area. According to Manucci (Storia-de-Mogor, Vol. II, p. 425), wherever there existed water facilities and productive soil in the Suba of Ajmer, harvests were plentiful and so also milk and butter. For details of the agricultural produce of the region see G.N.Sharma, op.cit., p. 295.
 3. The Chambal river formed a boundary between Banswara and Dungarpur and Khari divided Udaipur and Ajmer-Merwara. The Imperial Gazetteer of Rajputana, pp. 234, 353.

a distinct ghat or plateau-wall. This is pierced only at two points; Ghati, the famous Ghati-Chanda of Mughal records, at the south eastern corner of Mewar; and the pass south of Ranthambhor, known to Abdul Fazl as the Chhain Pass, by the name of the famous city near Ranthambhor and situated at the southern opening of the pass. There is no similar barrier to the north-east, the plateau more or less sloping gradually down to and up in a ring of broken, isolated rocky spurs, separating Upamal from the Gangetic plains. As a result, the hills around Ranthambhor assume great strategic importance. Ranthambhor by nature being a unique fortress which must always have been of military significance as guarding an otherwise exposed frontier.

To the north-west, the plateau is of course protected by the Aravallis. The one point where there is a gap in this range is Ajmer, which therefore, commands the easiest passage through the Aravallis. Central in position, it communicated by convenient routes with all the regions of Rajasthan. It was, therefore, natural that it should serve as the headquarters and a base for further operations in Rajasthan from the days of Sultan Qutbud-Din down to the period of the Mughals, when it was the capital of the Suba of Ajmer, which included the bulk of modern Rajasthan.

It is also interesting to consider the historical influences of the rivers of Rajasthan. Undoubtedly, these

often served to separate the territories of various tribes and sometimes marked the natural boundary between two or more states.¹ Their valleys attracted population; and towns like kota, Banswara, Mandal etc., were established on their banks. While none of the Rajasthan rivers could have been important channels of navigation, a river like Luni could provide a narrow corridor through the desert and thus make convenient land-route possible for trade and military passage between Ajmer and Gujarat.²

**C: RISE OF VARIOUS CLANS
IN RAJASTHAN DURING THE
PRE-SULTANATE PERIOD**

Nothing definite is known about the origins and early history of various tribes later known under the one

1. G.N.Sharma, op.cit., p. 16.

2. R.C.Temple, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 260.

common title of Rajput.¹ The area roughly comprising present area of Rajasthan contained a number of clans which occupied various territories mostly known after their geographical appellations or tribal names during the Pratihara and post-Pratihara period.

It seems that no single power held its sway over the entire state and it was split into a number of principalities controlled at various times by various tribes such as the Gurjara-Pratiharas of Mando and Kanauj, the Guhilas of Chatsu and Mewar, the Bhatias of Jaisalmer and the Chauhanas of Nadol, Jalor and Sakambhari, etc. In order to grasp the main outlines of the political situation in Rajasthan as it stood on the eve of the Ghorian conquests of Northern India, it seems appropriate to present in a summary for our present knowledge of all these various clans and dynasties.

-
1. Among the important clans that first gained prominence in Rajasthan were the Pratiharas of Maru, the Guhilas of Mewar, Mauryas of Kota and Chittor, the Bhatias of Jaisalmer, the Paramaras of Abu and the Chauhanas of Sakambhari, Nadol and Jalor. The abrupt rise of these and other dynasties in the region, has led to some controversy regarding their origin. A number of scholars like Tod, Crooke, D.R. Bhandarkar are inclined to regard them as Scythians of Central Asia and hence foreigners, while V.A. Smith ascribes some of them to indigenous stock. Some other scholars like C.V. Vaidya and G.H. Ojha have tried to put all of them under the Ksatriya fold. According to a recent theory, 'all warrior clans have an inherent right to be regarded as Ksatriyas - when 'Jati' or birth does not monopolise, guna and Karma conception asserts itself and various classes find their actual place in the society ... and the law it should be remembered applied as much to the Indians themselves as to foreign settlers.' Dashratha Sharma, Rajasthan Through the Ages (Bikaner, 1966) Vol. I, p. 105.

The Gurjara-Pratiharas of Rajasthan.

The first important clan which came into prominence was known as Gurjara-Pratihara,¹ and it established itself under Harichandra² in the region known as 'Gurjaratra'³ about the second half of the sixth century A.D.

The Gurjara-Pratiharas appear to have established

1. For the origin of the family from the legendary hero Lakshmana, see the Jodhpur inscription of V.S. 894/837 A.D. (E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 87-99 and J.R.A.S., 1894, pp. 1-9), cf. Jackson, Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, part 1, Appdx., III D.R.Bhandarkar, J.R.A.S., Vol. XXI, p. 413 ff. Both these scholars believe the foreign origin of the dynasty. For further details see K.M.Munshi, The glory that was Gurjaradesa, pp. 4-20 and B.N.Puri, The History of the Gurjara-Pratiharas, pp.1-6.
2. See the Jodhpur (V.S. 894/837 A.D.) and Ghatiyala (V.S. 918/861 A.D.) inscriptions (E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 87-99 and J.R.A.S., 1895, pp. 513-21 respectively). Allowing an average rule of twenty five years to each ruler, the progenitor of the family, Harichandra, may have lived in the second half of the 6th century.
3. There is much controversy about the term 'Gurjaratra', as to whether it was applied in geographical or ethnological sense. The word has variously been written as 'Gurjara-trabhumī' (E.I., Vol. V., p. 211), 'Gurjaratramandala' (Ibid., p. 210, fn.3), 'Gurjaradesa' (I.A., Vol. VI, p. 191) etc. For details see K.M.Munshi and B.N.Puri, op.cit., pp. 6-8 and p. 2 respectively.

their power in 'Mandyapura' (Mandor),¹ 'Medantaka',² and 'Bhilmalla' (Bhinmal),³ (all in Rajasthan) during their rule extending over twelve generations.

From the location of the above places which served as seats of Pratihara power, the 'Gurjaratrabhumi' of the epigraphs, it would seem, must have included central and eastern Rajputana. That initially the Pratihara kingdom comprised central Rajasthan is also indicated by Chinese traveller Hsien Tsang.⁴

Arab-Pratihara Conflict:

It is known from the account of the Arab historian Al Biladuri⁵ that the Arab commander Junaid⁶ (who held the

1. Mandyapura or Mandor lying in latitude 28' and longitude 72' (H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 1053 map No. 6) is said to have been captured by sons of Harichandra. E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 95, verse 12; J.R.A.S., 1895, p. 513 ff.
2. E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 95, verse 12; J.R.A.S., 1895, pp. 513 ff.
3. On Yuan Chwang's testimony (Beal: Buddhist records of Western World, Vol. II, p. 269). It is believed that Pi-lo-mo-lo (Bhilmalla) in Rajasthan was the capital of the Pratiharas.
4. Hsien Tsang mentions Kiu-she-lo with its capital at Pi-lo-mi-lo, which has been identified as Gurjaratra kingdom with its capital at Bhinmal. Beal, Buddhist Records, Vol. I, p. 165, fn.
5. Futuhu-i-Buldan, tr. Murgotten, Foundation of the Islamic State, Vol. II, p.
6. Junaid was the general of Caliph Hasham (724 to 743 A.D.).

territory of Sind during the reign of Caliph Hasham) led his forces against 'Marmad', 'Mandal', 'Bialman' and 'Jurz',¹ in addition to some other Indian principalities. From the identification of the above mentioned places, it seems that the whole of the Gurjara kingdom was invaded sometime between 724 and 743 A.D.

It further appears that both the Prathihara ruling houses, viz. the one under Harichandra (of Rajasthan) and the other under Nagabhata (of Kansuj), had to face the invasion under Junaid. While the first family was completely defeated, the second 'availed of an opportunity by driving away the Mlechchhas',² and laid the foundation of a new ruling house.³

1. 'Marmad' is identified with Maru-Mada comprising modern Jaisalmer and parts of Jodhpur.
'Mandal' is identified with Mendor in Jodhpur.
'Bailman' with Vallamendala, and
'Jurg' with Gurjara. E & D., Vol. I, p. 126 fn.

2. See Gwalior Prasasti of Bhoja, E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 107-114, verse 4.

॥ पञ्चमः. पुरातनं मुने मूलिकम् कदाचित् तस्मात् पञ्चमः ॥
सुदृढं पञ्चमं व लक्ष्मणेन्द्रा वि पासो हि वि ।

1.e. Nagabhatta I, appeared as the image of the old sage (Narayana) in a strange manner in as much as, having crushed the large armies of the powerful galechobha king, the destroyer of virtue, he shone with four arms brilliant on account of glittering terrible weapons.

3. K.M.Munshi, op.cit., p. 63.

The arab control over the Gurjaratra kingdom, however, does not seem to have been lasting since the available epigraphs¹ suggest that the later Gurjara-Pratihara rulers exercised uninterrupted control over the region.

From the two inscriptions, so far available about the Pratihara dynasty of Rajasthan, it is evident that Kakkuka, the last known ruler of the house, was alive in V.S. 918/861 A.D.² Further, it appears that the Gurjaratra rulers held sovereign position in the beginning³ but later on served as feudatories of the Kanauj branch of the Pratihara dynasty.⁴

Rajasthan during Imperial
Pratiharas of Kanauj:

As already stated the Gurjara - Pratiharas who started their political career, in Rajasthan, made Kanauj

1. E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 96.
2. Ghatiyala inscription of the above date. E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 87-99; J.R.A.S., 1896, pp. 613-21.
3. Jodhpur inscription of Nagabhatta, dated V.S. 872/815 A.D., E.I., Vol. IX, p. 199 ff; J.R.A.S., 1907, p. 1011. See also Bhandarkar's List, No. 22.
4. See Daulatpur (Jodhpur, now Ajmer Museum) inscription of Bhoja I, dated V.S. 900/843 A.D.; E.I., Vol. V., pp. 218 ff; J.B.R.A.S., Vol. XX, pp. 410 ff and Bhandarkar's List, No. 20.

their seat of power by the second half of the eighth century under a new family¹ whose progenitor was Nagabhatta I.²

The Gwalior inscription of Bhoja I,³ credits Nagabhatta with having crushed the armies of a powerful Mlechchha king which undoubtedly refers to an Arab raid under the Sind governor Junaid.⁴

The two immediate successors of Nagabhatta I, viz. Kakkuka or Kakustha and Devaraja are said to have 'added to the renown of the family' and 'curbed multitude of kings by having destroyed their allies and caused them to cast off their free movements.'⁵ Similarly Vatsaraja,

-
1. For the relations between the Pratihara family of Harichandra (Rajasthan) and Nagabhatta (Kanauj) see B.N.Puri, op.cit., pp. 26-28.
 2. The Gwalior prasasti records that Vatsaraja, the third successor of Nagabhatta, the founder, was ruling in Saka year 705/783 A.D. By allowing roughly 25 years to each ruler, Nagabhatta may have ruled round about 730 A.D. See also E.I., Vol. XXI, p. 197 ff. for a Chauhan grant that was made at Broach, in the reign of the glorious Nagavloka in V.S. 813/756 A.D. The Nagavloka of the inscription has been identified with Nagabhatta I, the founder of Kanauj family.
 3. E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 107-114, verse 4.
 4. Futuhu-l-Buldan, tr. Murgotten, op.cit., Vol. II.
 5. I.A., Vol. XVIII, pp. 107-108.

their successor, seems to have attained an authorotative position over Gurjaratra, to judge from the Osia¹ and Daulatpur² (both in Jodhpur) inscriptions.

Nagabhatta II, who came to the throne by the close of the eighth century is said to have forcibly seized the hill forts of the kings of Anarta, Malwa, Kirta, ~~Turushka~~, Vatsa and Matsya.³ The ~~Turushka~~ forts mentioned in the inscription perhaps belonged to the Arab possession in western India.

Bhoja I, the next important ruler of the dynasty seems to have ruled over a fairly large empire including Rajasthan where some of the small kingdoms accepted his suzerainty. The available inscriptions indicate that Bhoja I re-asserted his supremacy over the Gurjara-Prathiharas

1. J.A.A.S., 1907, p. 1010-

2. E.I., Vol. V, pp. 208-13. The Prithvirajavijaya also states that Chauhan Durlabharaja enjoyed Gauda (Bengal), and that his son Guvaka was honoured at the court of Nagavloka (E.I., Vol. II, pp. 121, 126). This leads us to suppose that Durlabharaja enjoyed Gauda territory with the assistance of Pratihara rulers. Cf. V.B.Mishra, The Gurjara Prathiharas and their times, p. 20.

3. E.I., Vol. I, p. 159 ff. and Bhandarkar's List, No.36. For identification of these places see V.B.Mishra, op.cit., p. 25; B.N.Puri, op.cit., p. 45, fn. 2-5.

of Rajasthan¹ and subdued the Guhilas of Chatsu² and the Chauhans of Sakambhari,³ which leaves little doubt that Bhoja's rule extended roughly over the entire Rajasthan.

The extensive empire of Bhoja I is noticed by the Arab traveller Sulaiman. In his account of the Gurjara prince he states that 'the king Baura (Bhoja) of Jura (Gurjaratra) maintained numerous forces and no other Indian prince had so fine a cavalry. He was unfriendly to the Arabs, still he acknowledged that the king of Arabs was the greatest of kings. Among the princes of India there was no greater foe of the Muhammadan faith than he.'⁴

1. The Prathihara authority which is known to have been acknowledged in Gurjaratra during the rule of Vatsaraja (J.R.A.S., 1907, p. 1010) had become ineffective after him. That the authority was again restored over Gurjaratra during the rule of Bhoja I is known from Daulatpur (Jodhpur) record of V.S. 900/843 A.D. See E.I., Vol. V, pp. 211 ff. and Bhandarkar's, List, No.20.
2. See Baladitya Guhila's Chatsu (Jaipur) inscription (E.I., Vol. XII, pp. 10-17) which says that Guhila prince Harsaraja conquered the kings in the north and presented horses to Bhoja. For identification of the Bhoja of this inscription with Bhoja I of Kanauj, see Bhandarkar's, List, P. 12.
3. The Pratapgarh (Rajputana, now in Ajmer Museum) inscription of Mahendrapaladeva issued in V.S. 1005/948 A.D. (I.A.A. Vol. XLV, p. 122, line 4 and E.I., Vol. XIV, p. 176), informs that 'A Chauhan family of kings was a source of great pleasure to king Bhojadeva.' See also Prithvirajavijaya, p. 137, verses 30-31.
4. E.A.D., Vol. I, pp.3-7.

It is also known from the testimony of the Arab geographer Masudi that Pratihara Mahipala's kingdom included some parts of Sind. Masudi who visited the valley in A.H. 303-304/915-16 A.D. states that the King of Kanauj was one of the kings of Sind.¹

The vast empire of Pratiharas which once touched the foot of the Himalayas,² extended up to Karnal in Haryana.³ Bengal in the east,⁴ Bundelkhand in the South⁵ and Saurashtra in the south-west,⁶ began to break up soon after the first decade of the tenth century. Many of the important territories were lost as a result of the raids by the Palas,⁷ Rashtrakutas⁸ and the Paramara⁹ and Chandellas.¹⁰ But the final blow was given to it by the invasions of Sultan : : Mahmud of Ghazni.

-
1. E. & D., Vol. I, pp. 21.
 2. I.A., Vol. XV, pp. 105-13.
 3. E.I., Vol. I, pp. 186 f.
 4. See Jodhpur inscription of Bauka, E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 87; Baroda copper plate of Kakkaraja, I.A., Vol. XII, p. 156.
 5. Gwalior Prasasti of Bhoja. See E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 107, verse 1.
 6. I.A., Vol. VII, p. 259 and verse 11 of Gwalior Prasasti; E.I., Vol. XVIII, p. 107.
 7. For details see R.D.Banerji, The Palas of Bengal.
 8. For details see A.S.Altakar, The Rashtrakutas and their Times, (Poona, 1934).
 9. For Paramaras see D.C.Ganguly, History of the Paramara Dynasty, (Decca, 1933).
 10. For Chandellas see N.S.Bose History of the Chandellas, (Calcutta, 1956) and S.K.Mitra, Early Rulers of Khajuraho (Calcutta, 1958).

Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni:

Sultan Mahmud's first onslaught was directed against the Hindu Shahis of Kabul and Punjab.¹ Bhera, which was under 'Biji Rai', was invaded in 1006-1007. The Rai is said to have committed suicide at the approach of Muslim forces and his principality was annexed to the Ghaznavide kingdom.² Jaipala's son Anandpala was attacked in 1005-1006 during Sultan's invasion to Multan, wherein the Rai was driven back.³ Anandpala and his allies, however, were decisively defeated in 1008-1009.⁴

'The gates of Hindustan', which were in Anandpala's possession, having been lost, not only sealed the fate of Punjab but of many other states also,⁵ which fell one after the other, including Kanauj, the seat of the Pratiharas, in 1018-1019 A.D.⁶

-
1. Rai Jaipal was defeated in 1001-1002 and he ended his life on a funeral pyre.
 2. For details see Mohammad Habib, Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni and M.Nazim, Life and Time of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna, Cambridge, 1931.
 3. Mohammad Habib, op.cit., p. 25. The governorship of Bhera was assigned to Sukhpal (Nawasa Shah) - a son of Anandpala who had been converted to Islam. See Ibid., p. 2.
 4. Ibid., pp. 27-32.
 5. Notably Thaneshwar (1011-1012), Baram and Mathura, (1018-1019). For details see Ibid., pp. 34-41.
 6. Ibid., pp. 41-46.

The Pratihara contemporary of Sultan Mahmud was Rajyapala. The chief on hearing the approach of the Sultan is said to have fled across the Ganga to Beri thus giving a free hand to the Sultan's forces to loot and plunder and return with enormous booty.¹

The cowardly act of Rajyapala is said to have led many chiefs to join² under the banner of Chandella ruler Vidyadhara. The later is recorded in the Mahoba inscription as having 'caused the destruction of the king of Kanyakubja.'³

The account left by Ibnul Asir⁴ corroborates the version of Chandella record. The chronicler states that 'Bida (Vidyadhara) the accursed, was the greatest of the rulers of India in the territory and had the largest armies and whose kingdom was called Kajuraha (Khajuraho), sent messages to Ray of Kanauj named Rajyapal rebuking him for his flight and the surrender Hostilities then broke out between them with the result that Rajyapal was killed in the fight...'.⁵

1. For details see Mohammad Habib, op.cit., pp. 41-46.

2. E. & D., Vol. II, p. 463, fn.1;

3. E. & D., Vol. I, pp. 219, 222. See also N.S.Bose, History of the Chandellas, pp. 55-60.

4. Kamil-ut-Tawarikh (ed. Bulak), Vol. IX, p. 115, f.

5. Ibid.

The next pratihara ruler whose name is spelt in Ibnul-Asir as Taru Jaibal or Taru Jaypal¹ (Trilochanpala) also 'lay prostrate at the feet of Mahmud', when the latter attacked him in the autumn of 1019 A.D.,² thus virtually putting an end to the Pratihara empire as an independent entity.³

Chauhans:

The fall of the Gurjara Pratihara empire brought many client dynasties to the fore-front, who carved out independent and semi-independent principalities in Rajasthan.

One of the most prominent clans, the Chauhans established themselves in the region around Sakambhari⁴

1. E. & D., Vol. II, p. 427.
2. Ibid.
3. From the Jhusi grant dated V.S. 1084/1027 A.D. and Kara inscription of V.S. 1093/1036 A.D. it appears that Trilochanpala and his successor Yashpala continued to hold the present district of Allahabad at least up to the date mentioned in last inscription. See I.A., Vol. XVIII, pp. 33-35 and I.R.A.S., 1927, pp. 692-95 respectively.
4. See Jayanaka, Prithvirajavijaya and Rajasekhara, Prabandhakosa which can claim acceptance as historical accounts dealing with the Chauhans, refer to Vasudeva as the first historical man of the Sakambhari line. "वेदे अथान पश्येत् तदमुजोदीर्घं सप्तद्विमादी ...
वसुदेवो नामकः वसुदेवः ।"
Jayanaka, P.V., Canto, 11, Shaloka, xxxixxxxixxxx
xxxxxix 86. See also Rajasekhara, P.K., p. 133 and Bijoliya rock inscription verse 12 (E.I., Vol. XXVI, p. 108). For the details of the origin and early history of the Chauhans see Dashratha Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties (Delhi, 1959).

(modern Sambhar). The dynasty later on extended its area up to Jangaladesha.¹ (present Bikaner and northern Marwar).

The earliest known epigraph of the dynasty dated V.S. 1030/973 A.D. shows the Chauhan rulers to have acknowledged Pratihara overlordship.² The Chauhans who thus at the beginning ruled over Sakambhari in a feudatory capacity could increase their power and territories only after the fall of Pratihara empire.

Vigraharaja II,³ one of the early rulers of the line, is said to have not only defeated the Chaulukya Mularaja, but even fought against the Muslims.⁴ Another ruler Govindaraja III, earned the title of Vairighratta

-
1. The Jaina works of 11th and later centuries designate the Chauhan as the kings of Jangal-desha. Vasantvilasa, canto III, verses 209-32 and Sukrata - Samkirtana, III, verse 42 (cited in G.C. Chaudhary, Political History of Northern India, p. 124, fn.4).
 2. Harsha stone Inscription, E.I., Vol. II, pp. 116-30.
 3. For his reign see Harsha stone inscription, op.cit., fn.3.
 4. Jayanaka, P.V., Canto V. verses; Suri, H.M.K., p. 9 and Merutunga, Prabandhaointamani, pp. 15-16; Ferishta, T.E., tr. Briggs, Vol. I, pp. 7, 18. Ferishta writes that the Ray of Ajmer sent a contingent to join the league organised by the shahi ruler against Sabuktighin in 997. The statement, however, has met serious criticism by the scholars.

and claimed a victory over Sultan Mahmud.¹

It seems that the invasions under Mahmud and his successors became more frequent in Rajasthan as a number of epigraphic records refer to the Chauhan conflict with Muslims.²

1. ^{"21/92"} Jayanaka, P.V., Canto, V.P. 57; Rajasekhara, P.K. (geneology), p. 133. For details about Sultan Mahmud's invasion of Somnath, see Ibn Asir, Kamil-ut-Tawarikh, tr. E. & D., Vol. II, pp. 468-71, and Tarikh-i-Alfi, tr. E. & D., Vol. pp. 471-77. That Sultan Mahmud returned via Mansura, 'the ruler of which place was an apostate Muhammadan', is known from Ibn Asir's version, who is our earliest source mentioning the return march of the Sultan through Sind. Nizamud-Din (Tabaqat-i-Akbari, text., p.9) states that Param Deo _____, the ruler of Gujarat blocked the route of Mahmud, whereupon the latter returned via Multan. To this Ferishta (T.E., text., p. 34) adds that Param Deo and the Raja of Ajmer with others had collected a great army in the desert to oppose his return. Mahmud determined to march direct to Multan. His army suffered greatly for want of water and his cavalry for want of forage but in A.H. 417/1026 A.D. he reached Ghazni.
- "و چون پیر آدمیو راجه اجیمه دغیره لشکری عظیم گرد آورد سر راه بر سلطان گریزند بودند -
 سلطان در جنگ صلوات نمیدیدند از راه سنده متوجه ملتان درین راه یافت و عثقت
 بسیار رفتی رسید گویند ..."

2. Arnoraja is recorded in a Sanskrit inscription as having rescued his brother Prithvipala of Nadol (during Durlabhraja) from a 'Turushka attack'. Another Sanskrit grant mentions Asaraja's brother-in-law Haripala to have fought with certain Hammira. For text of both these inscriptions see Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D. pp. 186 and 190.

The Prithvirajavijaya Kavya states that Durlabharaja III Chauhan lost his life in a battle against the Matungas, a term used for the Muslims.¹

The title of Paramabhattarka - Maharajadhiraja Parameshwara of Prithviraja I, indicates the growing independent power of the 'Sapadlaksha' Chauhans. His struggle against the Muslims referred to by Prabandhakosa³ was perhaps directed against one of the commanders of Masud III⁴ (1099-1115).

Ajayraja, the son and successor of Prithviraja I is similarly credited with having won a victory over the Garjana Matungas⁵ - quite obviously standing for Muslims

1. Jayanaka, P.V., Canto V, verse 70. |

"मौलि सिर उल्लिखित-वर्ण-पिङ्ग-मौलि
अथवा गुलाब-वर्ण-पिङ्ग-मौलि-द्वयः" Jonaraja,
the commentator of Prithvirajavijaya equates the
term matunga with the Muslim invaders from the
north-west, "अथवा गुलाब-वर्ण-पिङ्ग-मौलि
पिङ्ग-मौलि-द्वयः गुलाब-वर्ण-पिङ्ग-मौलि-द्वयः". That the
term was applied for the Ghaznavides is known from
a further reference in the same work. (ibid., Canto,
verse 113). In the Sanskrit literary works like
Dashkumaracharita and Kathasaritsagara, matunga has
been used to denote a man of lowest rank as well as

4. P.R. (W.C.), 1909-10, p. 52.

Ajmer.¹ This is confirmed by Prithvirajavijaya Kavya.²

The occupation of Delhi and Hansi from the Tomaras³ by Bisaldeva brought the Chauhans into a direct conflict with the Muslims - A struggle for supremacy over northern India that is partly supported by epigraphic and literary evidence,⁴ now ensued.

A Chauhan inscription dated 1167 from Hansi⁵ records the strengthening of Hansi and appointment of

1. "पुरे (द) देवागति ... पुरीयते नृपकेशर दले
विजिते सम्राज्यमेव भूमिः ।"

For full text of the above inscription see Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 180-81.

2. Jayanaka, P.V., Canto VI, shalokas 1-27.

3. R.I., Vol. I, pp. 93-95.

"लोमशोत्तरं पश्यति राज्यं प्रह्लादकेतुः ।
यदिमाना नृपकेशराः प्रजापालितवराः ॥"

The above inscription from Sarban (now in Delhi Museum) is dated Phalgun Sudi 5, V.S. 1384.

4. Delhi Shivalik Pillar Inscription V.S. 1220, records Vigraharaja fourth as having 'rendered' Aryavratra worthy of its name by the repeated extermination of the Mlecchabhhas.

"आधिपते यथापि पुरातनं तुलनात् मलेच्छे सिद्धेतामिदमेव ।
मोक्षमरीचि जगति विजयते वीर्यमयं यो विपलः ।"

I.A., Vol. XIX, p. 215. See also Lalitvighraha Nataka, (cited in Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 61).

5. I.A., Vol. XLI, p. 19 reads: "मला हर्षयि वरि... प्रथम (पु.)
रापिना, दुर्गगमुज ।"

Kelhana as its Governor, by Prithviraja II. This not only suggests the continuation of hostilities between the Chauhans and the Muslims (who had by now held control over Panjab) but also the growing power of the Chauhans in an area closely adjoining Panjab, the seat of Muslim power.

The Chauhan claims of victory over the Ghaznavide rulers, however, even during the weak rulers like Khusrau Shah and Khusrau Malik, seems only to be 'vague and conventional' and despite their growing power, the Chauhans did not take a real offensive to put an end to Ghaznavide rule in the Panjab - a task later accomplished by Muizzud-Din Muhammad of Ghor in 1186.

The Chauhans of Nadol:

A branch of the Sapadlaksha (Sambhar) Chauhans established itself at Nadol (Jodhpur) by the last quarter of the tenth century under its leader, Rawal Lakha or Lakshman.¹ The dynasty gradually increased in power and one of the members of the line, Anahila is said to have defeated Chaulukya Bhima I (1022-64), captured Sakambhari, killed the general of Parama Bhoja (1011-55) and

1. Puratanaprabandhasangraha, text., p. 102; Hainsi, N.K., text., Vol. I, p. 100. See also Kirtipala's Nadol plate, verse 2, and Mandor fragmentary inscription, line 6, for mention of Lakha's name.

defeated the army of the powerful Turushkas.¹

The reference to Turushka possibly indicates either Alhana's encounter with some local Muslim chief of Sind or most probably Sultan Mahmud during the latter's attack of Sannath, (1025). Since Balaprasad, the successor of Anahila was a contemporary of Chaulukya ruler Bhima I of Gujarat (whose last date is V.S. 1120/1063 A.D.), Anahila possibly lived before this date and most probably in the first quarter of the eleventh century when Sultan Mahmud invaded Sannath.

This display of power was, however, temporary and the small principality of Nadol could not stand in the way of the other powerful dynasties like the Chauhans of Sambhar, Paramaras and Chaulukyas, the last of whom obtained effective sway over Nadol. Inscriptions show the Chauhans of Nadol as having accepted Chaulukya overlordship at least up to V.S. 1228.²

Kelhana (1162-92), an important ruler of Nadol line, who initially shared power with his father Alhana, subsequently acquired much strength. Apart from his other exploits, the Sundha hill inscription credits him with

1. Sundha Hill (Jodhpur) inscription, verse 17, E.I., Vol. IX, p. 74.

2. The Nadol inscription of this date mentions the victorious reign of Chaulukya Kumarapala when Kelhana was ruling at Nadol. E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 103-104.

having destroyed the power of Turushkas and to have erected a golden gateway.¹

Kelhana's fight with the Turushka king (identified with Sultan Muizzud-Din of Ghor), probably as a Chaulukya feudatory is also corroborated by Prithvirajavijaya Kavya.²

The Chauhans of Jalor:

Another sub-division of the Chauhans established itself at Jalor which had previously been ruled over by a dynasty of Paramara chiefs.³ Kirtipala, the founder of this line was the youngest son of Alhana (V.S. 1221-1250). Although he was granted 12 villages⁴ as early as V.S. 1218 and shared the government of Nadol,⁵ but he

1. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 69. "... *पृथ्वीराजः पालाशः च* ..."
2. Jayanaka, P.V., Canto X, p. 50. For further details about the history of Nadol Chauhans, see Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 120-141.
3. An inscription of V.S. 1174/1118 A.D. found from 'Topkhana' at Jalor records the names of the six Paramara chiefs (Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 145). According to Hainsi also Paramara Kuntapala was ruling over Jalor and Virmanarayana over Sivana at the time of its capture by Kirtipala. Hainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 203.
*"नवतः अश्वमेधं यजेत् २०५८ इति । तदा जालोरं पञ्च कुलपतिः
 अश्वमेधं यजेत् । पञ्च कुलपतिः अश्वमेधं यजेत् । अश्वमेधं यजेत् । अश्वमेधं यजेत् । अश्वमेधं यजेत् ।"*
4. E.I., Vol. IX., pp. 68 ff.
5. Ibid., Vol. XVII, p. 208 and Vol. IX, p. 77.

sought his fortune temporarily in Mewar.¹ His conflict with his contemporary Sultan Muizzud-Din of Ghor, would be dealt elsewhere.

Guhilas of Mewar:

The Guhilots² originally belonging to Gurjaratra,³ settled in Rajasthan and founded an independent ruling house in Mewar as early as the first quarter of the eighth century under Bappa Rawal.⁴

In the beginning, the Guhilas remained feudatories of the Mauryas of Chittor, Gurjara Pratiharas of Kanauj,

1. G.H.Ojha, D.R.I., p. 36; Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 78; Kumbhalgadh Prasasti, R.I., Vol. XVI, p. 349.
2. 'Gehlot' is a corruption of Sanskrit word Guhilaputra. For a record of 1278 A.D. from Chittor recording 'Simha' as a Guhilaputra, see R.I., p. 75.
For details about the origin of Guhilots see also M.L.Mathur, Mewar in Pre-Mughal India, unpublished thesis, Rajasthan University, (Jaipur, 1952), pp. 1-18.
3. The earliest member of this family viz Guhila flourished in the 6th century A.D. See Aitpur inscription (V.S. 1034). For the earliest record of Guhilas, see I.A., Vol. XXXIX, pp. 186-91.
4. A gold coin of this ruler indicates Guhilas to be Suryavanshis. See Nagri Parisharni Patrika, Vol. I, Part III, (V.S. 1977), pp. 241-85. Bappa is credited with having defeated Raja Man of Hori clan and captured the fortress of Chittor in about V.S. 791/734 A.D.

Chaulukyas of Anahilwara, Paramaras of Malwa and Chauhans of Sambhar. Any attempt on the part of the Guhilas to assert their independence was frustrated by these powerful kingdoms.¹

Nothing important is known about the princes of this line preceding Samanta Simha (1171-1202) and it seems that Chaulukya Kumarapala held the territory of Mewar in V.S. 1209/1152 A.D.² and that its chiefs continued to rule there at least up to 1206 A.D.

At the close of the twelfth century, the history of Mewar took a new turn. Although Samanta Simha is credited with a victory over Solanki ruler Ajayapala (V.S. 1231/ 1174 A.D.), he was in turn defeated by Kiritipala the founder of Jalor branch of the Chauhans³ and the latter occupied Mewar sometimes between 1175 and 1179.

-
1. For references to Mewar being subjugated by these clans see G.C. Chaudhary, Political History of Northern India, (Amritsar, 1963), p. 171 and H.C. Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 1162.
 2. An inscription of V.S. 1207/1150 A.D. from Chittor records Kumarapala to have gifted a village to the local temple (E.I., Vol. IX, p. 12). The Mangrol inscription of V.S. 1202/1146 A.D. mentions Maluka of Guhila family as Kumarapala's vassal. See E.I., pp. 153-60.
 3. The Ahad (Udaipur) inscription of V.S. 1263/1206 A.D. while giving the geneology of Gujarat chiefs from Mularaja to Bhima II records the grant of Ahad to a Brahmin. G.H. Ojha, D.R.I., pp. 48-49, fn.2.

Mewar thus lost, Samta Simha went over to Bagar (Dungarpur Banswara) and established his hold over the region.¹ The throne of Mewar, however, was recovered by his younger brother Kumar Simha, (with the assistance of Bhima III and Sesodia Samanta Rana Bhuvanpala), whose descendants afterwards ruled over the principality of Mewar.²

Bhatias of Jaisalmer:

A branch of the Jodon/Yadavas, known as Bhatias,³ (after one of the chiefs of this name) was established in desert area of modern Jaisalmer which was formerly known as Vallanada.⁴ Some of the early inscriptions of this dynasty shows that the Bhatias held independent position in

1. For two inscriptions of Samanta Simha, see A.R.R.M., 1914-15.
2. Ashleshwar inscription (mt. Abu) of V.S. 1342/1285 A.D. of the time of Raval Samar Singh records that Kumar Singh recovered his lost territories of Mewar. (I.A., Vol. XVI, p. 349). That the Guhilas recovered Ahad with the assistance of the Gujarat rulers is known from Kumbhalgadh inscription. *॥ स्वर्ग नरनाथ ॥ ३२ गुज्जो नृप ॥*
See E.I., Vol. XVI, p. 349. *महादेवः ...*
3. For the origin and history of the early rulers of Bhati clan, see Naini, N.K., Vol. II (R.O.R.I.), text., pp. 1-38.
4. Devaraja Bhati, one of the rulers of this line is stated as 'the protector of Vallanadala in Bauka (Jodhpur) inscription of V.S. 894/837 A.D. See E.I., Vol. XVIII, pp. 96-97, verses 18-19.

that area. They bore imperial titles,¹ introduced their own era² asserted their supremacy over the Pratihara chiefs of Mandor.³

One of the Bhati chiefs named Jaisal is said to have migrated from Lodrava to the present site of Jaisalmer in V.S. 1212/1165 A.D.⁴

There are no instances to show that the Bhati chiefs came into conflict with the growing Muslim power in the north before the close of the thirteenth century. The Bhati chief Vijayaraja whose dates range from Bhatika Samvat 541 to 552/1165 A.D.⁵ seems to be no other

1. An inscription of Vijayaraja of 1115 A.D. entitles the ruler as

"परमोमहोरक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर ।"

2. The initial Bhatika Samvat falls in V.S. 680/623 A.D. The earliest inscription of this era is of Bhatika Samvat 534/V.S. 1214/1167 A.D. See Dashratha Sharma (ed.) Rajasthan Through the Ages, (Bikaner, 1966), Vol. I, p. 280.

3. See Bauka (Jodhpur) inscription, supra, fn. 4.

4. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, text., p. 32:

"संवत् १२१२ को संवत् १२१२ ईश्वर लिंग मूल चरवत
संवत् १२१२ को संवत् १२१२ ईश्वर लिंग मूल चरवत १"

It is however, difficult to agree with the date of the foundation of Jaisalmer as given in the bardic accounts. The subsequent events show that the foundation of Jaisalmer was laid only after the defeat of Bhoja during Sultan Muhammad of Ghor's invasion of Gujarat in 1178 A.D.

5. For text of the inscriptions see Dashratha Sharma (ed.) Rajasthan Through the Ages, Vol. I, p. 286, fn. 1 and 3.

than Vijayaraja nicknamed 'Lanja',¹ who is said to have married Chaulukya Sidhraj Jaisimha's daughter.² The regal titles born by the chief and his other 'chivalrous acts' narrated in the bardic accounts earned him the title of 'the portal of the north'.³ Jaisimha Sidhraj is known to have lived up to V.S. 1200/1143 A.D. If the marriage actually took place when Vijayaraja was young, we may safely assume his ascendancy to the throne well before Bhatika Samvat 541/1165 A.D., the first known date in his inscriptions. Again the title borne by him in this inscription also suggests that he may have occupied the throne at least some years before the date of the inscription.⁴

That Vijayaraja, or more probably his successor Bhoja⁵ had to face a Ghorian raid is indicated by the bardic account preserved by Nainsi.

The Bhati-Muslim conflict probably took place during the course of Sultan Muizud-Din's invasion of

1. 'राजल पञ्जराव लोका'.

Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, (R.O.R.I.), p. 33.

2. 'पञ्चराव जे सिधदे' पात्ता परलिय, हुत्ता' *ibid.*

3. "उत्तरे पदमि मंड पदमि" *ibid.*, p. 32.

4. Supra, p. XLIX, fn. 5.

5. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 33.

Gujarat in 1178 A.D., when the invading forces were defeated by the combined forces under Chaulukya prince Mularaja and his feudatories.¹ The field of this battle was Gadraraghata or Kashahrada,² located near the foot of Mt. Abu. It is possible that the Sultan may have sacked Lodrava - the then capital of Bhatls - during the course of his march to Gujarat. The assumption finds support from the bardic accounts preserved in Nainsi Khyat.³

It is stated that the Sultan during the course of his march encamped at a place one mile outside Lodrava at the invitation of Jaisal,⁴ (the brother of Vijayraja, who possibly took Muslim assistance in a bid to lay his own claims to the seat of Lodrava). The Sultan on hearing the war cry of the Bhati chief attacked and killed him and sacked Lodrava.⁵ After this victory the chieftainship of the town was entrusted to Hawal Jaisal.⁶

1. For details of this battle see Minhaj, T.N., Vol. I, pp. 481-82; Kiradu stone inscription of Bhima II, E.I., p. 72 and Nizamud-Din, T.A., tr. Vol. I, p. 36.

2. E.I., Vol. XVI, p. 273; Merutunga, Prabandhasintamani, p. 97, 154 and A.K. Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp. 131-33.

3. " पातसाह मुद्रवा थो कोस १ मेव रोमल दे लडे ३ तरिये थो ... " Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 34.

4. " पातसाह सहर मुद्रवा रोमल पर मार मरल जोमल देयो " ... " रोमल सोडा दे " ... " जजव पर " *ibid.* *ibid.*, p. 36.

5. *Ibid.* " पातसाह मुद्रवा देयो " ...

6. *Ibid.*

Rao Jaisal, after coming to power, transferred his seat from Lodrava to the present site of Jaisalmer and made it his capital. The event probably took place after V.S. 1234 i.e., after the sack of Lodrava by Sultan Muizud-Din's forces. The Lodrava seat of the Bhatias thus came to an end with the death of Rawal Bhoja (nephew of Jaisal)¹ at the hands of the Muslims and the subsequent foundation of Jaisalmer.

It may be pointed out that the first literary reference to Jaisalmer occurs in V.S. 1234/1178 A.D.², which is synchronous with the above events. The sack of Lodrava and seeking of a more safer place, may have been the motives of Jaisal in shifting his capital from Lodrava to Jaisalmer. Since the dates of Vijayraja are fixed on the basis of epigraphic evidence³ and the known fact that he was succeeded by Bhoja his nephew,⁴ it is difficult to accept the earlier date of the foundation of Jaisalmer given by Nainsi (A.D. 1155).

Rao Jaisal was succeeded by a line of Bhati rulers,

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 35.
2. Kharatarabrihidagurvavali, p. 34.
3. Supra, p. 49, fn. 5.
4. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 35.

including Salivahana I,¹ Kelhana,² Rawal Chachigdeva,³ Karan Singh,⁴ Jaitra Sinha, Rawal Lakhansen, Rawal Pimpala and Rawal Jeth Singh, who continued to hold the principality till the close of the thirteenth century.⁵ No Muslim invasion is recorded, and no Arabic or Persian inscription found in the Bhati principality; and it seems that the region was practically devoid of Muslim influence up to the beginning of Khalji rule.

OTHER MINOR DYNASTIES IN RAJASTHAN

Rashtrakutas of Hastikundi:

One of the branches of Rashtrakutas settled in Hastikundi (Jodhpur) and came to be known as the Rashtrakutas

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p.
2. According to an unconfirmed statement, Kelhana slew one Khizr Khan Bloch when the latter crossed Mithran (Indus) and invaded Bhati principality. Tod, Annals, Vol. II, p. 1208.
3. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p.
4. His last known date is V.S. 1340/1280 A.D. See Kharatarabhidagurvavli, p. 34. Karan Singh is said to have encountered one Muzaffar Khan when the latter demanded the daughter of a Brahmin Bhumiya. The latter, unwilling to comply, sought the help of Bhati chief who attacked and killed the Khan. (Tod., Annals, Vol. II, p. 1210). No Muslim governor of this name, is, however, known to have been at Nagaur at this time. An inscription dated Iind Jumadi, A.H. 666/17th Feb., 1267 A.D. gives the name of Balban and one Malik-Malukish-sharq, Saifud-Daulat wad-Din Ahmad. See I.A.A.R., 1958-59, p. 64.
5. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 39-43.

of Hastikundi.¹ A stone inscription from village Bijapur (Bali district in Jodhpur) within the principality of rulers of this line consists of two records dated V.S. 996/949 A.D. and V.S. 1051/997 A.D. respectively.

Paramaras of Banswara:

Apart from Malwa,³ a branch of the Paramaras ruled over the principality of Banswara in the later half of the eleventh century A.D. This is attested to by two inscriptions found from Arthuna dated V.S. 1109/1063 A.D. and 1169/1102 A.D.⁴

Paramaras of Chandravati and Abu.

Two other branches of Paramaras are known to have established themselves in at least three regions in Rajasthan, namely Banswara, Chandravati/Abu and Kiaradu (Jodhpur).

1. " *एषः शिवः खलु ज्ञानं ध्यात्वा रामायणं च श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतां च पठति...* "

Ea.I., Vol. X, p. 23, verse 3 (i.e. Vidyadhara was a Rashtrakuta king).

2. Pt. Ram Karna, 'Bijapur inscription of Devela of Hastikundi', *Ea.I.*, Vol. X., pp. 17-24.

3. The Paramaras had their original seat at Malwa. Under Bhoja (1010-55) the dynasty claimed an important rank. After his death, however, its rulers were reduced to an insignificant status of Mahakumaras. In the first quarter of the 13th century. Devapala ruled over Malwa and exercised his authority in the region extending from Bhilsa to Broach. For details, see U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, pp. 5-6.

4. *Ea.I.*, Vol. IX, pp. 10-15;
A.R.R.M., 1916, p. 2

From the Vasantgarh stone inscription we know that a Paramara branch ruled over the principality of Chandravati and Abu in the middle of the eleventh century.¹ The Paramaras of this line, however, held the territory of Chandravati and Abu, as feudatories of the Chaulukya kings of Gujarat.

Dharavarsha of this line (1163-1219) is known to have been the Mandleshwara² of no less than four Chaulukya kings from Kumarapala to Bhima II (1144-1241).

The Paramaras of Kiradu.

A fragmentary inscription dated V.S. 1218/1161 A.D., from Kiradu (Jodhpur), after tracing the origin of Paramaras from a sacrificial fire-pit on Mt. Abu, refers to a chain of rulers among whom was a powerful king named Sindhuraja, ruling over 'Marumandala'.³ The rulers of this branch were possibly scions of the Abu line. The Paramaras of Kiradu

1. E.I., Vol. IX, pp. 10-16. See also Jhalodi (Sirohi) temple inscription dated V.S. 1255, Arbuda Jaina Lekha Sandoha, part iv, p. 108; Mt. Abu inscription dated V.S. 1287/1230 A.D. E.I., Vol. VIII, pp. 200-204, 208-19 and Ray, D.I.I., Vol. II, p. 913.

2. See colophon of Jinetadharmakatha - Ratnasena Katha (Singhi Jaina Grantha Mala, No. XVIII), p. 109 and Arasena (Sirohi) dated V.S. 1276/1219 A.D. inscription; Arbuda Jaina Lekha Sandoha, part iv, No. 311, p. 108.

3. P.C.Nahar, J.I.S., Vol. I, pp. 251-53.

too like those of Abu, acted as feudatories of the Chaulukya rulers.¹

Another inscription from Kiradu dated V.S. 1209/1162 A.D., records Nadol Chauhan Alhana as a feudatory of the Chaulukya Kumarapala.² This may show that either the Chauhans temporarily ousted the Paramaras from Kiradu in the middle of the twelfth century, or they held the place which was afterwards given over to the Paramaras in 1161 A.D.

To sum up, three important Rajput clans viz, the Chaulukyas, Chauhans and Paramaras, shared the different principalities of Rajasthan at the close of the twelfth century. These clans, however, failed to offer a united front against the external invasions during the two centuries preceeding the final conquest of Northern India by the Turks.

Partly due to their internal rivalries and partly due to their sub-divisions, they considerably weakened their strength and the three contemporaries of Muhammad of Ghor - Prithviraja III, Mularaja II, and Bhima II, and the Paramaras Devapala and Dharavarsha (of Malwa and Abu

1. " अक्षर. देवद/हल- च/गुदय मार/हल. १ "

E.I., Vol. XX, Appdx., p. 47.

2. G.V.Acharya, Historical inscriptions of Gujarat, Vol. II, No. 148.

respectively) individually turned out to be too weak to withstand the Ghorian invasions.

D: THE RAJPUT RULING ORDER

Most of the ruling dynasties in Rajasthan, which later came to be designated 'Rajputs', seem in fact to have formed out of an assimilation of various tribes, each of whom claimed a different origin but had gradually merged into the ruling class.

It may be pointed out that the term 'Rajput' in the sense we use it today, is not found in any of the sources before the fifteenth century. Next to the term 'Hindu', the most common term used in case of many of these clans by the Persian chroniclers was Raa and Rana¹ etc.

At the time of Turkish invasions, many of the well known 'Rajput' clans of later times had come to be recognised as belonging to the 'Kshatriya' caste. It is interesting to note that some of the clans had begun to

1. Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, text., p. 22;
Nizami, T.M., text., pp. 94, 108, 184, 185 and 227;
Barani, T.F.S., text., pp. 36, 52, 59, 125, 163, 213
 and Yahya, T.M.S., text., pp. 8-11.

connect themselves with the Sun, Moon, Fire and Sea etc.¹, in a bid to prove their high martial status.

Very little is known about the system of political organisation of these proto - 'Rajput' clans. What one can dimly discern is the emergence of distinct categories of autonomous or semi-autonomous feudal chiefs under the rajas or rulers, going under names such as Rajaputra, panaka, rauta, Thakkura etc.

Rajaputra:

The term Rajaputra or Rajput found in the early medieval records from Rajasthan and elsewhere, meant the son of a raja, used either in the literal sense of prince or as an honorific.² In the latter case, the Rajaputra was a king of vassal, who was supposed to render certain

1. For details see Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 245. Reference may be made to the Rashtrakutas who now described them as Yadvas of Lunar family, though their earlier records had nothing to say about this. (A.S. Altekar, Rashtrakutas and their times, pp. 15-16). The Pratiharas became Raghuvanshis and described themselves as Lakshmana's descendants in an inscription of Bhoja I. (Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 245 fn). The Paramaras similarly adopted a myth from the Ramayana. (Dashratha Sharma, 'Origin of the Paramaras', Rajasthan Bharati, Vol. III, part 11, p. 28).
2. A Chauhan grant of 1176 records the two sons of Kirtipala - Rajaputra Lakhsmanpala and Rajputra Abhaypala, (E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 1-5). For reference to Rajaputra in Gupta records of the 6th century and Gahadvala records of 12th century, see Ibid., Vol. XII, p. 142 and I.A., Vol. XIV, p. 102 and Vol. XVIII, p. 136.

services to the state, in return for land granted or assigned to him.¹

The term Rajaputra therefore, during the period of our study, was not the name of a caste such as we understand to day; and there are no instances to show if the different tribes regarded each other as any thing other than just Kshatriya clans.

Apart from Rajaputra, early medieval inscriptions from Rajasthan state that such land grants were also made to the upper urban as well as rural class in Rajasthan. This class has been referred in different chronicles and inscriptions of the pre-Sultanate and Sultanate period as Rai, Rana, Rawat, Thakur, Mugaddam, Khot, Samanta and Chaudhuri etc.

Rai and Rana or Rana:

The term Rai and Ranaka or Rana has been used for a powerful Hindu chief by the Persian chronicles of the thirteenth century. Later on the term came to be applied to a tributary chief who enjoyed internal autonomy and was obliged to pay a fixed tribute to the central authority.

-
1. E.I., Vol. XI, No.4 and Vol. XVIII, p. 53. Under Samar Simha Chauhana (S/o Kirtipala) his maternal uncle Rajaputra 'Jojala' acted as a Rajyachintika, i.e. a minister or a general administrator. (Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 202). However, the term was applied in case of a lowest ranking fief - holder in the Chaulukya epigraphs. See Ram Sarn Sharma, Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient, Vol.IX, pp. 86-98.

Ranaka has been used in the early medieval inscriptions and afterwards in the thirteenth century Sanskrit works and Persian chronicles.

The Lekhapaddhati, a twelfth century Sanskrit text, defining the obligations of a fief - holder in early medieval Gujarat and Marwar, reproduces three characters. According to the first the king could grant a Ranaka, a country (desha) probably meaning a mandala.¹

In the second charter, the Ranaka undertook to accept the charter issued by Mahamatya and to pay all dues to the grantee. Lastly, the Ranaka sub-infeuded a village to Rajaputra who was required to collect the revenue, to furnish 100 foot-soldiers and 20 cavalry for the service of the Ranaka at his head-quarters besides maintaining law and order in the fief.²

This sort of sub-infeudation prevailed widely during the Pratihara rule which extended over Rajasthan, Gujarat and Maharashtra. The beneficiary was given the right to cultivate his benifice or to get it cultivated, to enjoy it or to get it enjoyed, to undertake its

1. Lekhapaddhati, (ed.) C.D. Dalal etc., G.O.S., No. XIX, (Baroda, 1925), p. 7.

2. Ibid.

cultivation or to get it done.¹

The text of the Lekhapaddhati thus indicates a feudal polity in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries in Gujarat and Marwar, most of which was under the Chauhan dominions. From the contracts given in the Lekhapaddhati, it would be seen that the king or his mahesatya granted fiefs to the Ranakas who could sub-infeud it to the Rajaputras.

It would seem from the third of the above mentioned chart in the Lekhapaddhati that the Rajaputra could not only grant land but also increase taxes etc. It is, however, not clear whether or not the king intervened in case of a dispute between the Ranaka and his vassal, Rajaputra.² Again it is difficult to say how wide the area was that was entrusted to each category of these vassals.³

1. E.I., Vol. IX, No. I, plate A-1, 19; plate B-1, 63.
Cf. R.S.Sharma, Indian Feudalism,
p. 118, fn. 4.

2. R.S.Sharma, Indian Feudalism, pp. 201-202.

3. The Sukranitisa (tr. B.K.Sarkar, Vol.I, pp. 368-66 and 381-82) defines a Samanta, as a governor of 100 villages. Whatever might be the size of the areas assigned to these vassals, some Ranakas and Mandalash-Nakas, enjoyed practical ownership of land and executed religious grants with the permission of their over-lords. See R.S.Sharma, op.cit., p. 191.

It would thus be seen that the term Ranaka was used to indicate a subordinate ruler or a viceroy who conducted business of the state. This was a popular feudatory title in medieval Rajasthan. It seems to have been derived from Rajanka of early medieval copper grants of northern India. In these records, Rajanka has been placed after Rajan who was a feudatory but of higher rank. Rarely have Rajankas and Ranakas been distinguished.¹

Rauta/Rawat:

The term Rawat or Rauta was generally applied to Rajaputra, in early Chauhan, Gahadvalla and Chaulukya records.² It may thus be an early vernacular form of the Sanskrit Rajaputra and possibly indicates a distinct rank in early medieval Rajasthan.³

1. D.C.Sirkar, Indian Epigraphy (*Delhi*, 1965), pp. 342-43.
2. A Gahadvalla pillar inscription dated V.S. 1253/1197 A.D., makes the position of Rana and Rauta clear. The inscription records the erection of a pillar by Rauta Ananada, in the reign of Ranaka Vijaykarna. See Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XI, pp. 128-130. Cf. Roma Niyogi, the Gahadvallas (*Calcutta* 1959) Appdx., B. p. 260, No. 75.
3. D.C.Sirkar, op.cit., pp. 343-44. It has been suggested that the term is a corrupt form of Rajyachyuta - one deprived of a royal authority (*ibid.*). For the use of the term Rauta in Persian works. See Barani, T.F.S., text., pp. 182, 213 and Amir Khusrau, Tughluq Nama, text, p. 93. For distinction between Rana and Rauta, see J.A.S.B., 1911, pp. 763-65 and Roma Niyogi, op.cit., Appdx. B, p. 260, No. 75.

Although the term has been mostly applied in cases of the Chauhan and Chaulukya Rajaputras, who were the scions of respective royal families, it also came to be applied to Brahmana, Kshatriya and Sayasthas of Bundelkhand and U.P., the latter of whom were mostly unrelated to the ruling houses.¹

Chandella inscriptions show that the Rautas were granted land for military services, which was also a most important obligation of their counter-part - the Rajaputra.²

Thakkuras

Another term used synonymously with Rauta was Thakkura. The title was used in medieval records from the eighth to the thirteenth century. The Rautas and Thakkuras thus did not possess a princely status and were possibly entitled as such only when they had fallen down from some royal status.

Epigraphic evidence suggests that some Brahmana and Kshatriya families who were related to royal families and could not succeed to the throne due to some reasons and were thus placed in a subordinate position were entitled as such.³ The term Thakkura denoting a

1. Ram Saran Sharma, Indian Feudalism, pp. 193-94.

2. Ibid.

3. Upadhyay, Socio-religious History of Northern India, pp. 52-53.

feudatory continued to be in use in the Persian works until early in the thirteenth century.¹

Many early medieval inscriptions notably from Central India, record the grant of villages by different kings to Rautas and Thakkuras.²

It may, however, be noted that the title of Rauta and Thakkura was applied both to men of a Brahmana³ and Kshatriya⁴ castes. While the former got land grants for performing certain religious acts, the latter were recipients of landgrants and other gifts by virtue presumably of the chivalrous deeds, or in expectation of martial services.⁵

1. See Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, text., p. 33.

"خسروستان از راتقان و باسیان ...". It was written in 1206 A.D. and thus it may suggest the continuation of the term and the time of Turkish invasions of India. The grants of the Gahadvalla rulers also mention Thakkura at the close of the twelfth century. See Gahadvalla grants of V.S. 1207/1161 A.D. and V.S. 1246/1189 A.D. Rama Niyogi, op.cit., Appdx. B., Nos. 76 and 78.

2. E.I., Vol. XX, p. 133p Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XXI, p. 49; I.A., Vol. XVIII, pp. 138-39; E.I., Vol. IV, pp. 111-12; I.A., Vol. XV, pp. 7-13.

3. E.I., Vol. XX, p. 133.

4. Ibid., p. 133; Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XXI, p. 49; "राजा श्री वेद सायन जी तौर" नये, I.A., Vol. XVIII, pp. 138-39. "राजा श्री राजेश्वर विमल सायन जी" "

5. Archaeological Survey Report (Gwalior State), 1925-26, pp. 13-14; E.I., Vol. XVI, pp. 275-76; and ibid., Vol. XX, pp. 232-33.

Again a Rauta could either be a Kshatriya or a Brahmana.¹ In such cases, the title was perhaps applied to distinguish a Brahmana or Kshatriya, who once held or shared power from an ordinary Brahmana or Kshatriya. However, the exact interpretation of the title, whether it was used as a surname or as a designation by the Brahmanas and the Kshatriyas alike, is still uncertain.²

The early medieval records, mostly from central India,³ suggests that the title of Thakkura was given to those Brahmanas, who were primarily engaged in the worship of some deity. It would be equally interesting to note that there is a set of inscriptions which suggest that while a Brahmana bore the title of a Rauta, his father and grandfather were Thakkuras.⁴

It is possible that in the early period the ancestors of the Brahmana Rauta once functioned as priests. While the grandsons rose to the position of a

1. Upadhyay, Socio-Religious History of Northern India, pp. 52-53.

2. Ibid., p. 53.

3. E.I., Vol. IV, p. 131; Vol. VII, p. 100; Vol. XIII, p. 217 and Vol. XIX, p. 294.

4. The Rewa record of 12th century. I.A., Vol. XVII, pp. 232-34. Another Cahadvalla grant of 1177, records that (Vijaychandra) granted the village of Godanti to Rauta Rajyadharmavarman s/o Mahamataka Thakkura Vijaydhara. E.I., Vol. IV, p. 112.

kingdom. Both the terms were thus applied as a designation by some feudatories possibly of a lower category than Rauta and Thakkura.

Mugaddam and Khut:

With the advent of the Muslims in India, many titles like Mugaddam, Khut and Chaudhuri etc., began to be applied to local feudatories.

Mugaddam¹ is an Arabic word meaning the first man, i.e. chief or leading man. In the Mughal period and subsequently it has meant a village headman whose chief function was the collection and assessment of the revenue as an agent of the government. But in the Sultanate period, in addition to this meaning, it was also used simply to designate a (Hindu) chief or high officer of a Raja.²

Khut according to Moreland,³ was a Hindu chief subject to the Sultan. It is, however, doubtful whether he can be so called, because his duty seems to have been only collection of revenue and remitting it to the local

1. "مقدم", leader, Colonial. See F. Steingass, Arabic English Dictionary, p. 1040; Barani, T.F.S., text., Vol. I, p. 31.

2. Cf., use in Amir Khusrau, K.R., text., p. 68.

3. W.H. Moreland, Agrarian System of Moslem India, (Allahabad, 1929), pp. 225-26.

treasury.¹ Barani² used this term for a village headman. The term Khut may thus be identified with the Sanskrit word Gramkuta, or a village headman.³

The Khuts and Mugaddams held prominent position under the Sultans of Delhi, probably only next to Rais; and the Turkish rulers were obliged to rely mostly on their cooperation in matters of local administration. Barani warns the Sultans against the growth of their wealth and power.⁴

Chaudhuri:

Another term used was Chaudhuri.⁵ Ibn Batuta states that the Chaudhuri acted as the head of a sadi or a collection of hundred villages and was thus the chief of the local infidels.⁶ Chaudhuri thus represented a man of status intermediate between a chief, Rai and a village headman.

1. A.K.Sen, People and Politics in Early Medieval India (Calcutta, 1963), p. 113.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text., p. 291.

3. Hodiwala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, (Bombay, 1939), pp. 277-78.

4. Barani, T.F.S., text., Vol. I, p. 291. Barani, also uses the term 'Hindu' in case of upper class Hindus only and not for common peasantry. See Moreland, opcit., p. 32 fn.

5. Ibn Batuta, tr. H.A.R. Gibb, Ibn Batuta - Travels in Asia and Africa, (London, 1963), p. 2.

6. Barani, T.F.S., text., p. 106. ".... راجان و چودھریان و ساداتان"

The officials listed above who were either revenue collectors or the recipients of land grants in recognition of their services, enjoyed real power in the countryside; and the Sultans in matters of tax or tribute collection had to depend largely on their local and traditional influence.¹

It is not clear whether the offices of Muqaddam, Khut and Chaudhuri originated with the Delhi Sultanate or are taken over by the Sultans from earlier polity. Until now the existence of the offices and designations in the earlier times either in Rajasthan or elsewhere, has not been confirmed by epigraphic or literary evidence. It is therefore, likely that these had no antecedents in the earlier 'Rajput' polity.

Mawas or Mawasat:

Minhaj in his Tabaqat-i-Nasiri has used another term Mawas² (مواص) or Mawasat³ (مواصات) which according to English translators stood for the name of a territory.⁴ The Hindi meaning of Mawas is shelter or protection.

در بیان مواص غزیت بالذکر در

1. A.K.Sen, op.cit., p. 113.

2. Minhaj, T.N., text., p. 221; tr. p. 705.

3. Ibid., text., p. 306.

4. Elliot and Dowson (Vol. II, p. 355) translate it as Mewar whereas according to Briggs (tr. Tarikh-i-Ferishta) it was santpur near Abu.

Although there is some difficulty with respect to the exact meaning which Minhaj desired to convey by the word Mawas, it probably referred to the neighbouring independent Hindu tribes and the tracts they dwelt in.¹

Apart from the above mentioned offices, a number of others such as Girasia, Bhumia, and Pattawut etc., were also in use during the Mughal period. Although their existence is not confirmed during our period, it is possible that these too had their origin during our period.

The Girasia landholder of medieval Rajasthan was one who held Giras i.e. subsistence by a grant (Patta) of the province for which he had to perform service with specified quotas at home and abroad. This class of taverce was subject to resumption and was renewable, and was comparable to any other fief-holder.²

The holder of a land on the other hand, if a military vassal was called Bhumia. Bhumia one actually identified with the soil (bhumi). Bhumia held his land by prespective possession which was inherited as an

1. H.G.Raverty, tr. Minhaj, I.H., p. 705, fn. 7.

2. Tod., Annals, Vol. I, p. 133; P. Saran, Studies in Medieval Indian History, (Delhi, 1952), p. 15.

indefeasible patrimony and thus he does not renew his grant. The Bhumia, according to Tod,¹ was the counterpart of the allodial proprietor of Europe. He could be called upon for local service in the district where he resided and for a certain period only. A similar title Zamindar was bestowed upon the Hindu tributary sovereigns under the Mughals - not out of disrespect but in the true application of their own term Bhomia Raj, expressive of their tenacity to the soil.²

The Pattawut similarly signifies vassal chief of Rajasthan on mutual contract of support and fidelity. Whatever obligations it laid upon the vassal of service to his lord, corresponding duties of protection were imposed by it on the lord towards his vassal.³

Apart from this several other types of landed intermediaries emerged in Rajasthan as a result of gifts of religious grants. The grantees in such cases, were not only charged with the duty of maintaining law and order in the villages but also realising various revenues, which

1. Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 133.

2. Ibid., p. 393.

3. Ibid., p. 127.

could not have been possible without engaging subordinate staff for the purpose. Thus religious grantees too emerged as landed intermediaries in charge of police and fiscal duties and gradually held various agrarian and administrative rights.¹

*

1. For details see, R.S.Sharma 'Feudal elements in Pala and Pratihara polity', Proceedings of the Asian Congress, 1961, pp. 334-35.

CHAPTER * IITHE GHORIAN CONQUEST
OF RAJASTHAN

The Ghorian conquest of Rajput kingdoms in India during the close of twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, was largely the work of Qutbud-Din Aibak. He was one of the ablest lieutenants of Muhammad of Ghor; and the latter, after the second battle of Taraori, left him as a Viceroy over the Indian conquests. He actively assisted the Sultan during most of the conquests in Hindustan. It would, therefore, not be out of place here to mention some of those in order to have a full view of Aibak's activities in Rajasthan.

Since most of the north-western and central India, at the close of the twelfth century, was held by different Rajput dynasties, the task of defending Hindustan against the foreign invasions fell on the Rajputs and more particularly on the Chauhans.

The second battle of Taraori,¹ was one of the most decisive battles in the annals of Hindustan. The

1. Minhaj, T.N., tr. Raverty, p. 468. Minhaj refers to the date as 588 A.H./1192 A.D., which also finds corroboration from the Rajput traditional accounts.

Chauhan power was considerably weakened and they lost their extensive territories of 'Sapadlaksha'. Many of the non-Persian chronicles, ascribe Chauhan Prithviraja's defeat to the treacherous role of his minister, whose name has been written differently in various chronicles.¹ This might be convincing; but because the Chauhan forces were taken unaware by the fresh and well-equipped Muslim forces, they could in any case have done little under the circumstances.

The Muslims, though completely victorious in the battle, were not yet in a position to annex the Chauhan kingdom of Ajmer² to their newly carved Delhi Sultanate.

-
1. See Prabandhacintamani, p. 117; Puratanaprabandhasangraha, p. 178; Suri, H.M.K., Canto iii, verses 1-72 and tr. N.J.Kirtani, L.A., 1879, pp. 61-62.
 2. Ajmer (situated in lat. 26° 31' N, long. 74° 28' E.) is said to have been founded by Ajaypala, one of the early Chauhan chiefs. It was sacked in 1024 by Sultan Mahmud on his way to Somnath. Soon after the Ghorian conquest, Ajmer was annexed to the kingdom of Delhi. During Akbar's period the suba of Ajmer comprised of Mewar, Marwar and Harauti, which were separated in seven districts subdivided into 197 Parganas. The fort of Ajmer, named Taragarh, is built on the north-east end of a range of hills. (1300 ft. above the city) was built by Akbar about 1560-70 A.D. The present city was founded in the middle of the 12th century and its Jaina college was later converted into a mosque named Adhai-din-ka Jhopra by Qutbud-Din. For the description of Ajmer and its mosque, see Walter Hamilton, Description of Hindostan, (Delhi, 1971), Vol. I, p. 520 and Toy Sidney, The Fortified Cities of India, (London, 1965) pp. 85-88.

This finds partial confirmation from the statements of the contemporary chronicler Nizami.¹ The discovery of some copper coins with the legend 'Prithvirajadeva' on one side and 'Sultan Muhammad Sam' on the other, may also suggest that the Chauhan chief may have remained a captive or vassal of Muhammad of Ghor for sometime.²

After its occupation by the Ghorians, Ajmer was delivered over to Gobinda, a son of Prithviraja. The prince is said to have possessed the qualities of courage and wisdom.³

The nomination of Gobinda over his father's territories, did not please his dispossessed brethren, and the affairs of Ajmer remained far from

1. Nizami writes, 'The Chauhan chief was taken prisoner, but he managed to obtain his release or at least immunity from punishment. However, on account of his ancient hatred against the Muslims, he appears to have been detected in some intrigue and orders were issued for his death and the sword severed his head from his body'. Nizami, *T.M.*, text, pp. 108-109.

2. Thomas, The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, pp. 15-16.

3. Nizami, *T.M.*, text, p. 110. دلبر را پشاورا کہ شایا و عادت او دیل بردن و نیال
فرزانی پیدا بود۔

His name is written by the above chronicler as while Ferishta (*T.F.*, text, p.) writes him as This seems to be a mistranscription for 'Guya' - a well known contraction for Govinda. (Dashratha Sharma, *E.C.D.*, p. 102, fn. 1). The Hamira-mahakavya states the correct name as Gobinda. See Suri, *H.M.K.*, Canto, iv, 28.

satisfactory.¹ Hariraja, the brother of Prithviraja Chauhan, did not favour Gobinda's rule over Ajmer as a Muslim vassal, and he made repeated attempts to oust the latter from the principality of Ajmer.²

The Tajul Maasir states that after the occupation of Delhi, the chief Sadr, Qiwam-ul-Mulk Ruknud-Din Hamza, sent a Aibak intelligence about the rebellion of Hariraja, reporting that he 'had turned his face towards the siege of Ranthambhor and that the son of Rai Pithora (i.e. Gobinda) who had been advanced under the protection of the sublime court, was in a state of extreme danger.'³

1. Nizami, T.M., text., p. 138, states that 'In the Ramzan of 588 A.H./1194 A.D., one Jatwan جتوان read as Chauhan by Hodiwala, (studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 179) invaded Hansi, which was then under Nasratud-Din, but in the encounter with Qutbu-Din, near the borders of Bagar, he was defeated and slain.' According to the Jain source Kharataragachchhapattavali (I.H.Q., Vol. XXVI, p. 225). 'One Bhima Simha was the ruler or the Governor of Hansi, in V.S. 1228/1171 A.D. on the basis of which 'Jatwan' has been supposed to be one of the generals of this Bhima Simha. See Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 144. For details about Chauhan uprising in Hansi, see M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Medieval Hansi', Proceedings of Punjab History Conference, (Patiala, 1971), pp. 95-98.
2. Nizami writes him as كولا (T.M., text, p. 182). Ferishta (T.F., Vol. I, p. 60) has For correct name see Tunoti (Ajmer) inscription of V.S. 1251, A.R.R.M., 1911-12, pp. 2-5.
3. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 179; Ferishta (T.F., p. 61) writes that خبر رسید که بیهارن را بجهت از کوهستان الود خدو کرده با کولہ دلو بہتورست جنگ کرده از اجیر بپاہ رشتہ پور دہلویں گردانہ۔
i.e. it was reported that Hariraja Rajput marching from the hills of Alwar came to Ajmer where he fought a battle with Kola (Gobindaraja son of Pithora Prithviraja) and thereafter triumphantly marched in the direction of Ranthambhor. From the statement of Ferishta it appears that Hariraja partially succeeded in driving Gobinda away from Ajmer.

Having appointed Sabikul Mulk Nusrutud-Din to look after the affairs of Delhi, Qutbud-Din marched to the relief of Gobinda. Hariraja's attempt was made futile and at the approach of the royal forces, he is said to have 'placed his hands of weakness in the skirts of flight and for the fear of the blade of scimitar, fled like the wind with his Resurrectionless army.'¹ Gobinda was reinstated on the throne of Ajmer and was favoured with a robe of honour and other marks of favour. The Chauhan prince also sent abundant gifts, which included three golden melons.²

Gobinda's rule over the territory of Ajmer, probably as vassal, did not settle the affairs of the state on permanent basis and the Chauhans made another

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 182.

2. Ibid., pp. 17784; Tarikh-1-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, text, p. 23. It is obvious that Gobinda retained the possession of his father's dominions by paying heavy tribute from time to time. There is an obscure reference in Nizami that 'about this time the Rai (?) who had fled from Delhi had raised an army of idolaters Sultan Qutbud-Din having come to know of it, pursued him and when the wretch was taken, his head was severed from his body.' This Rai may be a chief who remained as a Muslim nominee at Delhi.

» چون تقریب کردند که راجا از دلی گریخته بود - حشری ایمنه است و قوی را او بلی شک و خاد و بهی و خاد و بهی
آورد - - - - - سر آن خاکسار از تن جدا ماند و خط دلی که دارا قات و مسکن و ملی او بود فرستاده اند - - -

See Nizami, T.M., text, pp. 185-86 and tr., E. & D., Vol. II, p. 220.

attempt under Hariraja, in 589 A.H./1193 A.D. 'raised the standards of perdition, opened the road of rebellion and despatched a strong contingent under one Jaitra (probably his general) towards Delhi.'¹

The forces under Hariraja's general, hard pressed the Ghorian garrison at Delhi. According to the Tajul-Maasir, 'the people were suddenly caught in darkness of his (Jaitra's) oppression and the blood and the property of the Mussalmans fell into danger and destruction.'²

In order to cope with this danger, Aibak divided his army into two groups. One was despatched to the relief of the Delhi garrison. The second, which included able and selected soldiers, marched under his own command in the scorching heat of mid-summer to encounter the 'Rajput' challenge.³

Hariraja's general, Jaitra, being unable to resist the Muslim forces in the open field, retreated and took shelter by the Ghorian troops and ultimately,

1. The name of the general is written as by Nizami (T.M., text, p. 341). Ferishta, (T.E., text, p. 61) writes him as ^{سیمرج راجپوت} which has been rendered as 'Chatur Ray' by Briggs, (T.E., tr., Vol. I, p. 194).

2. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 341.

أحوال مسلمانان درمن حمله و قتل اذتاد

3. Ibid, p. 343.

Hariraja realising further opposition futile, 'sacrificed himself in the flames of pyre.'¹ Nizami adds that the occupation of Ajmer was followed by the destruction of idol-temples and 'the re-establishment of the true religion,' and that the Raja and the other celebrated men of Hind visited 'the blessed lamp.'² The event must have occurred sometime after V.S. 1251/1195 A.D., the date of a grant found from Tanoti, which records the name of Hariraja and his wife Pratapdevi.³

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 350. "خود را با چشم و بے پر آب دانش سوزاں انداخت۔"
This is corroborated by the version of Suri,
see H.M.K., tr., L.A., 1879, p. 62.
2. One of the earliest and finest monuments testifying to Qutbud-Din's occupation of Ajmer is the great mosque, known as Adhai-din-ka Jhopra. It is difficult to assign the exact date of its construction or how and when it came to be called as such. That the mosque was built out of the Jaina temple material is evident from several Nagari inscriptions on its pillars. (Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. II, p. 260 and p. 1.) A Persian inscription found there, records its erection in Zil Hijah, A.H. 596/1200 A.D. (*ibid.*, and pl. LXXV, No. 1) It has been suggested that the above inscription possibly refers to some small mosque which originally occupied the same site and was built in a short period of two and a half days. The other inscription recording the name of 'Abul Muzaffar Ailtamash us Sultana Amir ul Muminin' suggests that the present structure was completed during the reign of Sultan Iltutmish. (*ibid.*, pp. 261-62). See also Toy Sidney, op.cit., p. 88. for details about mosque.
3. A.R.M.M., 1911-12, pp. 2-5.

The unsettled conditions created at Ajmer by the Ghorian invasion in 1195 are echoed in a fourteenth century Jain account, Kharataragachchhapattavali. It is stated that when the Jaina monk visited Ajmer in V.S. 1251/1195 A.D., he spent two months there in great distress as a result of Malechchha disturbance.¹

The annexation of Ajmer led the Chauhans to seek their fortune elsewhere. The result was the foundation of a new and independent Chauhan principality at Ranthambhor. It has already been noted that Gobinda was entrusted with charge of his father's kingdom of Ajmer. There he acted as a vassal of Muhammad of Ghor. However, being hardpressed by his uncle Hariraja, he vacated his ancestral place and took refuge in the tract of Ranthambhor. He thus founded the Ranthambhor line of the Chauhans, and Ranthambhor henceforth became one of the major centres of Chauhan power.²

1. Kharataragachchhapattavali, text, p. 44

"संवत् १२५१ तमे अजमेरे" पृष्ठ १ तम पं २०-२१, २२
 गोविन्द पालिकमहाक ६२ स्थितः...

See also Dashratha Sharma, I.H.Q., Vol. XI, p. 780 for a detailed notice of the pattavali.

2. It is difficult to ascertain the date of Gobinda's establishment at Ranthambhor. From the statement of Suri (H.M.K., tr. I.A., 1879, p. 62), it appears that Gobinda founded the kingdom of Ranthambhor only after the death of Hariraja.

Although being the founder of an important line of Chauhans of Ranthambhor, Gobinda finds no mention in the contemporary Sanskrit epigraphic or literary sources. A later Sanskrit source, Hammiramahakavya,¹ states explicitly that Gobinda being driven out of the kingdom by his father, had by his bravery acquired the new kingdom and established his capital at Ranthambhor.² Before his exit from his ancestral kingdom of Ajmer, Gobinda had accepted Muslim suzerainty,³ which might have given a temporary peace to his kingdom. The attempts on the part of his uncle Hariraja to dislodge him were possibly motivated by his own claims to the throne.

From the Tajul Maasir,⁴ it appears that as at Ajmer, Gobinda continued to recognise Ghorian suzerainty

1. Suri, H.M.K., Canto, IV, shalokas 20-32. The chronicle wrongly mentions Gobinda as a grandson of Prithviraja. (*ibid.*, shaloka 24). Suri also wrongly mentions that Gobinda was driven out by his father (*ibid.*, Canto. IV, shaloka 24). It was in fact Hariraja his uncle, who drove him away from the seat of Ajmer as mentioned by the contemporary account of Nizami. (*T.M.*, text., pp. 179-80).
2. For details, see M.S.Ahluwalia, 'Ranthambhor during the 13th century', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, (Jodhpur, 1960), pp. 110-112.
3. Nizami, T.M., text., p. 184; Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 102.
4. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 179.

while ruling over Ranthambhor. It is, however, doubtful if Ranthambhor had already been annexed under Sultan Muhammad of Ghor and Qutbud-Din Aibak, or that 'prince was compensated with Ranthambhor'¹ or that he 'acted as a Muslim protege.'²

It is obvious from Muslim as well as the Chauhan accounts that Hariraja succeeded in depriving Gobinda of the territory of Ajmer, whereupon the latter carved out an independent principality at Ranthambhor. The repeated attempts made by Hariraja and his general Jaitra,³ at least temporarily succeeded in ousting Gobinda from Ajmer. The attempts of Hariraja, however, were made futile by the active support of the Muslim force appointed at Ajmer. Despairing in his attempts, Hariraja burnt himself.⁴

Thangir:

A small principality known as Thangir (Bayana) then engaged Sultan Muhammad's attention. The principality

1. A.B.M.Habibullah, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India (Allahabad, 1967), p. 66.
2. R.C.Majumdar (ed.) History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. V, p. 84.
3. Nizami, T.M., text, pp. 179, 341 and 350.
4. Ibid., p. 350; Suri, H.M.K., Canto, IV, verses 18-19; A.R.R.M., 1911-12, p. 2.

of Bayana¹ with its famous fortresses like Vijayanandirgarh² and Tahangarh³ etc., in the old Bharatpur state was formerly known as 'Sripatha'.⁴ Bayana has recently been identified to be the modern name of old 'Bhadanka' kingdom comprising Bharatpur, Dholpur, Karauli and parts of Mathura and Alwar Districts.⁵

Bayana remained a place of great consequence and importance during the period of the Sultans of Delhi. Before the rule of the Lodis, Agra was a mere pargana under Bayana, which was the real capital of the province. Bayana may thus be considered to have been at that time a sort of secondary capital to Delhi.⁶

-
1. Minhaj, (T.N., text, Vol. I, p. 421), writes 'Bhayana'. Bayana lies on the left bank of river Gambir and is about 75 k.ms. to the south-west of Agra. (A.S.I., Vol. VI, p. 40); Ibn Batuta, Travels, p. 449.
 2. Six miles west of Bayana. For traditional account of its name after the Yadava ruler Vijaypala and its capture by the Muslims, see A.S.I., Vol. VI, pp. 54 and 56 and ibid., Vol. XX, pp. 81-82.
 3. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 421; Nizamud-Din, T.A., tr., Vol. I, p. 40; Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. VII, p. 137; I.A., Vol. XIV, p. 239 and Vol. XV, pp. 8-9.
 4. E.I., Vol. XXVI, p. 93 and ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 8, line 5.
 5. Dashratha Sharma (ed.), Rajasthan Through the Ages, (Bikaner, 1966), Vol. I, p. 21.
 6. A.S.I., Vol. VI, p. 53.

Tradition relates that Bayana was ruled over by the Yadava rulers some of whose records are also available, the earliest of which date back to the middle of the eleventh century.¹ One of its rulers Tahanpala is reported to have built the fort of Tahangarh, about forty kilo-meters south of the present Bayana.²

The fort must have been of considerable importance since it engaged the attention of Sultan Muhammad of Ghor as early as A.H. 591/1195 A.D. The capture of Tahangarh is mentioned by the contemporary chronicles Nizami and Minhaj.³

The Yadava ruler over the territory of Bayana during this time was Rai Kunwarpala.⁴ The chief who was proud of his large forces and strength of his castle, however, failed to resist the combined forces of Sultan Muhammad of Ghor and Qutbud-Din Aibak and escaped disaster by agreeing to pay the usual tributes etc.⁵ The

1. M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Bayana during Sultanate of Delhi', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, (Jodhpur, 1967), pp. 39-40.

2. A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 53.

3. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 371; Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 145.

4. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 374.

5. Ibid, p. 374.

fortress, after its capture was entrusted to Malik Bahaud-Din Tughril,¹ one of the trusted slaves of the Sultan.

This is supported by an inscription found from Kaman in Bharatpur district. The inscription which was earlier assigned to Sultan Iltutmish by Cunningham, appears on recent examination to be dated A.H. 600/1204 A.D. The letters of the text containing the name of the reigning king and the object of the construction have peeled off. The name of governor Tughril Sultani, by whom evidently Bahaud-Din Tughril is meant, is quite legible.²

Bayana under the administration of Malik Bahaud-Din according to Minhaj³, became flourishing and prosperous through his efforts. Soon it became a flourishing town and a big centre of trade. Merchants of repute from different parts of Hindustan and Khurasan flocked there. The chronicler further informs that the fortress being unfit for residence, Malik Bahaud-Din founded in the territory of Bayana, the city of Sultankot. He stationed there a strong body of forces and continuously raided the

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 375; Minhaj, T.M., text, p. 145.

2. I.A.A.R., 1965-66, p. 24 (11)

3. Minhaj, T.M., text, p. 421; tr. Raverty, p.544.

adjoining territories.¹

The year 591 A.H./1195 A.D. also witnessed the disappearance of many of the Rajput kingdoms in Rajasthan, like those of Nadol, Pali and Mt. Abu, and also the Chaulukya kingdom of Gujarat, during Aibak's invasion of Naharwala, the capital of Gujarat.

The Tajul Maasir tells us that, when Aibak was at Ajmer, he got intelligence of the rebellion of the Mehr tribe.² The members of the tribe seem to have appealed to Rai Karana of Gujarat, for the latter's assistance in ousting a small contingent of the Turkish forces stationed at Ajmer.³

Qutbud-Din Aibak, having received the information, attacked the advance guard of the Mehr army. In the battle, lasting for the whole day, nothing was decided. Next day, however, at the approach of the Naharwala forces, the Muslim troops lost the battle. Many soldiers of their army, including their commander, Aibak himself, were seriously wounded in the battle.⁴

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 421.

2. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 61. Briggs (tr. T.F., p. 195) writes of the Raja of Nagaur and others. This, however, is not found in the lithographed text of Ferishta's work.

3. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 394.

4. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 26 and tr. Raverty, p. 52, fn. Ferishta states that the Sultan was carried in a litter to Ajmer. T.F., tr., Vol. I, p. 196.

The victorious army now encamped within one parasang of Ajmer.¹ Aibak's defeat in the battle compelled him to appeal to Ghazni for the reinforcements, which were swiftly despatched by his master under renowned generals.² The combined forces now marched on towards Naharwala - the capital of Chaulukya kingdom of Gujarat, in order to avenge the earlier defeat of Sultan Muhammad of Ghor at the hands of Chaulukya forces.

The troops under Qutbud-Din Aibak marched by way of Pali and Nadol, the feudatory principalities of the Chaulukya ruler Bhima II. Both the places, according to Muslim chronicle, were vacated and therefore, easily occupied by the invading forces. It is further stated that the people of both the places gathered under the

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 394-407. The hostile chiefs seem to have encamped here at least up to the month of Safar, 593 A.D./June 1197 A.D. when received reinforcements from Ghazni. The Rajput accounts (E.I., Vol. XIII, p. 208) describe the battle as taking place in a village named Kasahrada in the Sirchi state at the foot of Mt. Abu (cf., Nizami T.M., tr., E.&D., Vol. II, p. 230). Inscriptions suggest that it was Kelhana chauhan of Nadol and his brother Kirtipala who won the battle against the Muslims. (E.I., Vol. IX, p. 69 and *ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p. 208).
2. Nizami, T.M., text, pp. 408-09.

combined forces of Rai Wallan¹ and Dharavarsha², the Paramara feudatories of Bhima II of Gujarat, near the foot of Mt. Abu.³

The Muslim forces, under Aibak, finding themselves at a place where Sultan Muhammad of Ghor had earlier been defeated and wounded, abandoned the plan of measuring swords with their enemy in the encounter. The Rajputs, however, considering it an act of cowardice on the part of the Muslims, left the pass and moved on towards the plain.

Qutbud-Din Aibak's strategy and farsightedness won the day in the severe battle that ensued from dawn to mid-day on 13th Rabi-ul Awwal, 593 A.H./3,4 February 1197 A.D. The Rajput forces were completely routed.

-
1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411 "والان" (Wallan) probably is a mistranscription of Pahlān, i.e. Prahlādāna, who, according to Abu inscription dated V.S. 1287 was the brother of Paramara Dharavarsha of Abu. I.A., 1924, pp. 100-102.
 2. "داروارشا", Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411. He is correctly identified with Dharavarsha, the Paramara of Abu. (H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 918). Many of his inscriptions bearing the dates V.S. 1220 to 1276 have been found (I.A., 1927, pp. 47-48). The Abu inscription dated V.S. 1265 records Dharavarsha as a feudatory of the Chaulukya Bhima, and in this capacity, he probably led the Chaulukya forces against Aibak in 1197 A.D. (E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 72-73); cf. Hammiranadamarāna, G.O.S., No.X.
 3. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411.

About 50,000 are said to have been slain, 20,000 captured alive; and twenty elephants, besides other valuables, fell into the hands of victorious army.¹ After the victory, Aibak marched unopposed towards Naharwala, which place he completely sacked.² He then returned to Delhi via Ajmer.³

For Qutbud-Din's subsequent operations in Rajasthan, we have little information to hand. The Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah states that after the conquest of Chandrawal and Kanauj, etc., in 595 A.H./1198-99 A.D., the Wilayat of 'Siroh' was annexed. This could possibly be the kingdom of Sirohi.⁴ But the word is probably to

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411.

2. Ibid., p. 422. The Khartaragachchha Jainacharya, Jinapati, too witnessed the sack of Anahilpattaka, by the invading Muslim forces. The Kharataraga chchhapattavali, (text, p. 44), states that:
 "सं १२५३ इत्यं मङ्गलं चतुर्दशमे चतुर्मासे शुक्ल..."
 There is also a reference to one Sridhara during Chaulukya Bhima's reign in Veraval Inscription, who is recorded to have fought against one 'Hammvira'.

"चक्र हं गिर अहमज्ज मं न रोचः मीयरे ..."
 (E.I., Vol. II, p. 445). This may possibly refer to either Muhammad of Ghor's or Aibak's invasion of the kingdom of the Gujarat.

3. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411.

4. Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, text, p. 224.
 "دیرت سردها بگشتاد ..." It was probably the kingdom of Sirohi, the foundation of which is usually stated to have been laid during the period. Erskine, Rajasthan Gazetteer, p. 237; Habibullah, op.cit., p. 68.

be read 'Sarwa', this being a place in Awadh. Aibak also invaded Malwa,¹ but details of the invasion are wanting.

The repeated attempts on the part of the Chauhans, during the period, to regain the lost territories failed not only due to their reliance on numerical strength of forces rather than skill, fighting strength and methods of warfare, but also because of their energies being exhausted against the neighbouring Rajput kingdoms, notably, the Chaulukyas, Chandellas and Gahadwallas.

Aibak's forces on the other hand, although not greater in numbers, were adept in tactics and art of warfare. His army consisted not only the Ghorian khurasani and Khalji troops, but also included the contingents of Indian Ranakas and Thakkuras etc.² This must have added to the fighting strength of his troops.

In a short span of about six years, Aibak thus led successful invasions into most parts of Rajasthan. However, he probably succeeded only in establishing a superficial suzerainty over Rajasthan. Due to his policy of non-annexation, his authority could hardly have penetrated to the lower levels. His distant and nominal

1. Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, p. 24;
Minhaj, T.H., tr. Raverty, p. 140.
2. Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarakshah, text, p. 33.

”حکومت ہندوستان از راتقان و تکران ---“

control could hardly bring any significant change in Rajasthan or the Rajput ruling order. Much went on as usual. In spite of the Muslim chronicle's usual and repeated references to the destruction of the idol/temple, followed by every invasion, we hardly find any notable monument, with the exception of Adhai-din-ka Jhopra, that was built during Albak's time.

The permanent annexation of the conquered principalities in Rajasthan, was never thought of seriously. This policy not only resulted in the independence of most of the invaded territories, but even led to the establishment of new principalities, as boastfully recorded in unbroken series of epigraphs from Rajasthan.¹

*

1. For further details, see M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Muslim Penetration into Rajasthan - A study based on epigraphic evidence', P.I.H.C., (Mysore, 1966), pp. 144-162.

CHAPTER * IIIILTUTMISH'S OPERATIONS
IN RAJASTHAN

Sultan Shamsud-Din Iltutmish was perhaps the most important ruler of the pre-Khalji period. He not only held his sway over the inherited territories but even invaded some kingdoms in western Rajasthan, which had not so far been touched.

At the time of his accession, Iltutmish inherited suzerainty over territories like Ajmer, Nadol, Pali, Mt. Abu and Nagaur etc., which had previously been attacked by Qutbud-Din Aibak.¹ As we have seen Aibak's campaigns had not conclusively established the authority of the Sultanate over Rajasthan. The Rajput supremacy over Rajasthan had not been effectively destroyed and given favourable circumstances, the Rajputs might yet have regained lost kingdoms or carved out new principalities.

1. See Supra, pp. 73-9/ Apart from this number of Muslim inscriptions found in Nagaur (dated A.H. 594 and A.H. 606); Ajmer (21st Jamadi, A.H. 596); Khatu Kalan (Jamadi 1, A.H. 599) and Kaman fort Bharatpur etc., (A.H. 600) prove Muslim penetration in to these regions. See appendix, List of Muslim Inscriptions at the end of this thesis.

Ajmer and Nagaur seem to have been the principal towns in Rajasthan in possession of Iltutmish at the beginning of his reign. An inscription on the mosque of 'Adhai Din Ka Jhopra', at Ajmer records that the erection of this building was ordered by Sultan and it also gives full titles of Iltutmish.¹ This is sufficient to show that the mosque must have been completed, if not entirely constructed during his reign. Similarly Nagaur² not only became one of the earliest mint-towns³ in Rajasthan but also served as a centre of Muslim scholars and Sufis.⁴

1. "سليمان الاستدئين الشرق ابن المظفر التمش السلطان ناصر المومنين"

E.I.M., 1911-12, p. 30 and Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. II, p. 261.

2. Two inscriptions of Sultan Iltutmish have recently been found in Bari Khatu (situated in Jael Tehsil of Nagaur), which record the construction of a mosque by one Masud in Ramzan 629 A.H. (June/July 1232 A.D.) during the reign of Iltutmish. See Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1966, pp. 6-7.
3. Thomas (The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 78), refers to a rare gold coin struck at Nagaur in 608 A.H., i.e. in the second year of Sultan's reign. The coin weighs 70.6 grs. The obverse side gives the picture of a horseman and name of the mint, while the margin gives date and name of the Sultan.
4. The Chishti saints established their centres in many parts of Rajasthan like, Ajmer, Narnaul, Sival, and Nagaur etc., even before the Turkish conquest of Hindustan, as would be mentioned subsequently. Mystic works like, Fawa'id-ul-Fuwa'id, Sarur-us-Sadur, and Siyar-ul-Auliya etc., throw interesting light on their activities in Rajasthan and elsewhere. For details see K.A.Nizami, Some aspects of Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth century, pp. 181-219.

Apart from these two places, Iltutmish seems to have held most of the north-eastern parts of Rajasthan, extending from Palwal¹ to at least Ajmer and Nagaur in the west. The name and the titles of the Sultan are clearly readable in two Persian inscriptions found over the 'Chausath' and 'Assi Khamba' mosques, both situated in the Bharatpur territory.²

However, it is very doubtful if the Sultan held an effective sway over the principalities like Jalor, Nadol, Bhinmal, Pali, Jaisalmer, Ranthambhor, Sirohi, Chittor and Mt. Abu, although some of them had been invaded by Sultan Qutbud-Din Aibak.

Most of the territories in Rajasthan, occupied earlier, had not only asserted their independence but the Rajput Chiefs even carved out new principalities during the early years of Iltutmish's reign. The Chauhan kingdom of Jalor, under its ruler Udaya Simha, held supremacy over the adjoining territories of Nadol, Mandor, Barmer, Ratanpur, Sanchor, Radhadhara, Kher, Ramsin and Bhinmal.³ The inscriptions even credit Udaya Simha with having 'curbed the pride of Turushkas.'⁴ It seems that the

1. For a Persian inscription of the Sultan found at Palwal Idgah in Gurgaon District of Haryana, see E.I.M., 1911-12, pp. 2-3.

2. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 54-56.

3. E.I., Vol. IX, pp. 72-73.

4. Ibid.

Chauhans gathered strength during the early years of Iltutmish reign, which later compelled the Sultan to invade Jalor and other Chauhan possessions.

Again, the remaining descendants of Chauhan, Prithviraja III, being ousted from their ancestral kingdom, succeeded in establishing themselves at Ranthambhor, and the list of its successive rulers, as given by Hammiramahakavya¹ shows that the new principality was firmly established. Moreover, at a short distance from Delhi, the Jadon Bhatias established themselves in places like Bayana, Thangir etc.²

Iltutmish seems to have led no major campaign in Rajasthan during the first fifteen years of his reign and his first recorded invasion was against Ranthambhor,³ although Nizami puts Jalor as the first in the series.

Minhaj puts the year of the campaign against Ranthambhor as 623 A.H. and gives a brief but interesting account of Sultan's operations. 'The fort', he says, 'was famous throughout Hindustan for its exceeding strength,'

1. I.A., 1879, pp. 60-68.

2. Cunningham, A.S.R., Vol. XX, pp. 10-11. Habibullah suggests that Ajmer too was lost because of its subsequent inclusion among Iltutmish's conquests. See A.B.M., Habibullah, The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India (Allahabad, 1967), p. 101.

3. Written as "نتیور" by Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 445.

solidity and impregnability¹. ... Seventy or more kings had appeared (at various times) at the foot of its walls, but not one of them had been able to reduce it until 623 A.H. when it was taken by the Sultan's servants.'²

Ranthambhor lies in the S.E. corner of Jaipur. It stands on the top of a hill, 700 ft, above its foot in the midst of a dense forest of hills, gorges, and defiles nine miles N.E. of Sawai Madhopur. The only practical approach to the fort was, as is now, from the west, through the valley running west to east towards it. In addition to the four gates of entrance, there are three other gates in the curtain opening on the very steep path.³ According to Amir Khusrau, it was situated at a distance of two week's march from Delhi and was surrounded by a massive wall of 3 kos in circumference.⁴

An inscription dated V.S. 1272/1215 A.D. found at Manglana in Jodhpur, refers to 'Surtrana Lititimishi of Jognipura',⁵ when Allahana was the 'Gadhapatti' of Ranthambhor fort, which perhaps suggests Allahandeva's acceptance of Sultan's over-lordship. This 'Allahana' is probably

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 448.

دولت قلعه (راکھ) در حصارت و استحكام در تمام محاکم
هندوستان مذکور و مشهور است -

2. Ibid., pp. 455-56 and Raverty's tr., pp. 610-11.

3. For description of the fort, see Toy Sidney, The Fortified Cities of India, pp. 75-80.

4. Khusrau, Dewal Rani Khizr Khan, p. 65.

5. Suri, H.M.A., tr. L.A., 1879, p. 62.

identical with Vallahnadeva, or Balhan, the son of Gobinda. It seems probably that the subsequent conduct of Allahanadeva at Ranthambhor, perhaps his discontinuance of acknowledgement of Sultan's over-lordship, induced the Sultan to lead an expedition against him in 1226 A.D.¹ The campaign, however, resulted only in a temporary success and the kingdom of Ranthambhor could not be annexed to the Sultanate, as would be seen subsequently.²

Mandor:

The early history of Mandor (ancient Mandavyapura) is not very clear. It seems that the place was in possession of the Pratiharas during the first quarter of the seventh century.³ Some records of the Chauhanas of Nadol have also been found from this place. The Mandor⁴

-
1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 172.
 2. For further details, see M.S.Ahluwalia, 'Ranthambhor during 13th century', Rajasthan History Congress, 1st session, (Jodhpur, 1967), pp. 110-112.
 3. E.I., Vol. IV, p. 31; Ibid, Vol. XXXIX, p. 191 and H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 153-63.
 4. This is the modern town of Mandor lying 5 miles north of Jodhpur. A mosque built there during Khalji period is still in existence and contains a fragmentary inscription of Sonigara Chauhan Samant Singh. See B.N. Rau, Marwar ka Itihas (Jodhpur, 1938), pp. 8-10. For the history of Mandor and detailed description of its remains, see Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XXIII, pp. 73-85; Erskine, Rajputana Gazetteer, pp. 196-98; K.C.Jain, 'History of Mandor', P.I.H.C., Gauhati session, 1959 and B.S.Mathur, 'Side-Lights on the Medieval History of Nagaur', P.I.H.C., 1966, pp. 139-144.

fragmentary inscription of the period of Sahajapala, mentions Lakshmana as the founder of Nadol line of the Chauhans.¹

Mandor served as an important outpost of the Nadol Chauhans during the reign of Vighrapala, Asaraja, Sahajapala, Allahanadeva and Kelhana.² Kelhana's son Maharajaputra Chamundarya ruled at Mandor in V.S. 1227 after which it passed into the hand of Chauhans of Jalor.³

A year subsequent to the invasion of Ranthambhor, Sultan Iltutmish marched against the for of Mandor. Minhaj writes of this place within the limits of the Sivalik⁴

1. A.S.I., 1909-10, part II, p. 102.

2. For further details see Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 123-28.

3. See Gundha Hill inscription, E.I., Vol. IX, p. 73.

4. "از حدود سواتک حق تعالی آن فتح اور میر گزاید" (Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 446). Nizamud-Din Ahmad's Tabaqat-i-Akbari and Mirati-Jahan Numa, write Mandwar. Perishta (T.F., text, p. 66) has Mandu which is wrong. See also Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 220 and Isami, E.S., text, p. 116 ff. The term 'Shiwalik' has been very loosely used by the Muslim writers. According to Wassaf (tr. E.D., Vol. IV, p. 31) it contained 125,000 towns and villages. Minhaj places Nagaur, Ajmer and Mandor all within the limits of Sivalik "در بلاد ناگور و مندور و راجپر". (T.N., text, p. 468). The Mandor of Minhaj seems to be the modern Mandor lying 5 miles north of Jodhpur and not Mandawar, lying about 40 miles s.w. of Kotla in Mewat region as suggested by Hodiwala (studies in Indo-Muslim History, pp. 393-94). Hodiwala makes that place identical with Mahindwari/Hindwari in Mewat. It may be mentioned here that Mahindwari is referred to only during the rule of Abu Bakr Shah (1388-89), when he proceeded there to curb the rebellion of Mewatis under Bahadur Nahar. The ruins

(territory). The place was easily captured and a large booty fell into the hands of the victorious army. The annexation of Mandor like Ranthambhor, however, was not accomplished on a permanent footing and perhaps it soon passed into the hands of the Chauhans since it had to be reconquered by the later Sultans.

Jalor:

The kingdom of Jalor¹ was one of the important possessions of the Chauhans, and from its foundation by Kirtipala² up to its last ruler Kanhada Deva Chauhan, (after it was finally annexed by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji) it appears prominently in the history of Rajasthan. Many of its princes had to contend with their contemporary Sultans of Delhi in a bid to retain possession of this small kingdom. Like the kingdom of Ranthambhor, it saw its rise and fall during the Delhi Sultanate.

From pre-page:

At Nagaur too suggest the immense strength which the place might have enjoyed sometime. It served the capital of Parihara chiefs who held the place till recently. See Census Report, Marwar, 1891, Vol. II, p. 31, and Tod, Annals, Vol. II, p. 940, fn. 2.

1. Written as 'Jablipura' *जबलिपुर* in epigraphs and literary works. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 77 and Puratanaprabandhasangraha, p. 50.
2. Kirtipala (for his grant see E.I., Vol. IX, p. 66), the youngest son of Allahana, not only possessed Nadol (E.I., Vol. IX, p. 77) but even succeeded in capturing Mewar from Guhila Samant Singh for some period. G.H. Ojha, D.R.I., p. 35. Mewar, however, was recovered by Kumar Simha, younger brother of Samant Singh with the help of Chaulukyas. E.I., Vol. XVI, p. 349.

The kingdom founded by Kirtipala, was successfully retained by his successors, Samar Simha¹ and Udaya Simha,² the last of whom was a contemporary of Iltutmish.

The Chauhan under Udaya Simha, seem to have carved out a compact kingdom, and the Sundha inscription³ credits him with having taken possession of the territories of Nadol, Mandor, Vagbhatmeru (Barmer), Surachanda, Ratahrda (or Radhadhara), in possession of the Paramaras,⁴ Kheda (in Malani), Ramsainya (Ramsen) Srimala (Bhinmal), Ratnapur, and Satyapura (Sandhor) etc.

Most of the above mentioned places were once a part of the Chaulukya empire, but were seized from Lavanprasad (a minister of Gujarat) sometime about V.S. 1278/1222 A.D. by Udaya Simha. He is said to have formed an alliance with Guhilas, Paramaras and the other important rulers of Marwar, Gordraha and Lata etc., against the Chaulukyas, which ultimately resulted in a treaty.⁵

-
1. For his two inscriptions, see E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 53-55. His son Manva Simha's descendants were the founders of the Chauhan kingdom of Chandrawati and Abu.
 2. For his inscriptions, see E.G., Vol. I, part 1, pp. 474-76 and E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 56-57.
 3. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 73.
 4. Hainsi, E.K., Vol. I, p. 233; Vol. II, p. 341.
 5. Kirti Kausudi, Vol. IV, p. 59; Hammiranadamaradana, p. II and Lekhapaddhati, (G.O.S.), p. 52. For details see also Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 149-50.

The expansion of the kingdom of Jalor under Udaya Simha perhaps took place during the early years of Iltutmish's reign. The Sundha inscription mentioned above, also credits Udaya Simha with having curbed the pride of the Turushkas,¹ and this finds partial confirmation from the Tajul-Maasir as well as an apbhramsa verse.²

The increasing power of the Jalor Chauhans, ultimately brought Udaya Simha and Iltutmish face to face in the former's desert capital. The contemporary authority Tajul Maasir, puts the campaign in the early years of Sultan's reign. But this is probably a mistake. The Tajul Maasir states that 'it was represented to his majesty that the inhabitants of Jalor fort had determined to revenge the blood which had been shed. ... The Sultan on getting this intelligence collected a huge force consisting of able commanders, like Ruknud-Din, Bakhtiyar, Nasirud-Din Mardan Shah, Nasirud-Din Ali, and Badrud-Din Saukartigin etc., all of whom were valient men and skilful archers.'³

-
1. "गुप्तसाम्राज्य" E.I., Vol. IX, p. 78.
 2. Puratanaprabandhasangraha, p. 50; Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 153.
 3. E. & D., Vol. II, pp. 238. Minhaj fails to furnish either the name of the Jalor prince or the details of Sultan's invasion over his kingdom. However, Jalor is included among the list of victories of Sultan Iltutmish. See I.N., tr., p. 627.

The march to Jalor, however, was not an easy one due to the excessive heat and scarcity of water, and above all the Rajput defenders, who resembling no less than the 'faces of demons and spirits', were ready to face the invaders.¹

'Udai Shah' is said to have 'taken shelter within the four walls of exceedingly strong fortress, the gates of which had never been opened by any emperor.'²

Being hard pressed, the Chauhan chief is said to have sued for peace, which included the offer of one hundred camels and 20 horses³ and in return was received by the Sultan with favours including the restoration of his fortress.⁴ It may, however, be safely assumed that the Jalor campaign did not yield the desired results. This was perhaps mainly because of the geographical position of the principality.

Though it apparently accepted the overlordship of the Sultan, the Jalor kingdom does not seem to have been firmly

1. E. & D., Vol. II, p. 238.

2. Ibid.

3. Puratanaprabandhasangraha, pp. 50-51, puts the terms of settlement at payment of 36 lac drammas by Udaya Simha as well as son of his minister Yasovira as a hostage to the Sultan. This may be a biased and pro-Chaulukya statement, but at least it confirms the fact of the peace treaty narrated by the Persian chronicle.

4. Nizami, T.M., tr., E. & D., Vol. II, p. 238.

brought under subjection, since we learn that within five years of this invasion (probably in V.S. 1278/1222 A.D. when Iltutmish invaded the Guhilots of Mewar and advanced towards Gujarat, Udaya Simha acted in league with the Gujarat and Marwar princes and the Sultan had to retreat without giving battle.¹ The Sultan's control over Mander² too seems to have slipped away, since we find it enlisted among Udaya Simha's possessions.³

The traditional accounts record an invasion of Sultan Jalalud-Din against Jalor in V.S. 1310, corresponding to the year 1254 A.D., wherein he was defeated by Udaya Simha.⁴

However, since at that time it was not Sultan Jalalud-Din but Nasirud-Din Mahmud (1246-1266) on the throne of Delhi, it seems that it refers either to the invasion of Sultan Iltutmish, who was the contemporary of Udaya Simha, or to some subsequent invasion, which might have resulted in the chiefs' retaining the fortress.

1. Hammiramadamardana, pp. 11, 21-24.
2. See Supra, pp.
3. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 73.
4. See Puratanaprabandhasangraha, pp.

Nainsi, who probably drew his information from the above source, refers to the same couplet and adds:-

"मुंदर मर-अलु गंध (दोम) जालु मुं पडुं १ च पोहे
36 पय 12 पहे 283 नए नारी गंध पोहे।"
Nainsi, who probably drew his information from the
above source, refers to the same couplet and adds:-
"उदे मीए जामीरा जालेर फल। पन्या अपर सेवत 1298 गते मुंदर
जालालद) मुंदराय जालेर अपर आपा हुला मुं गंधा..."

Mewar:

The Guhilots who had established themselves in Mewar as early as the last quarter of the sixth century, are not reported to have come into conflict with either Muizzud-Din or Qutbud-Din Aibak. However, there are several instances suggesting their conflicts with the Muslims during the early phase of Turkish *expansion* in India.

Chittor the seat of early Guhilas, held a strategic position. The boundaries of the Guhilas touched the Sultanate of Ajmer and the sultans could hardly tolerate a powerful Guhila kingdom unmolested behind. This may possibly explain the reasons of several references to the Guhila chiefs's encounters with the Muslims in the inscriptions as well as the Sanskrit chronicles.¹

The contemporary of Sultan Iltutmish at the throne of Mewar was Guhila Jaitra Simha, whose dates range from 1213 to 1256.² He is said to have come into conflict with

-
1. Khoman Raso of Daulat/Dalpat Vijay (written during 17th century or even later) and Rajprasastimahakavya, E.I., Vol. XXXIX, cited in G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 424, 457.
 2. See Ekalinga inscription dated V.S. 1270/1213 A.D. for the first date of Guhila Jaitra Simha, E.I., p. 93 and Bhandarkar's List, No. 462. His last date is known from a manuscript written during his reign. G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. II, p. 47.

the Sultans of Delhi twice, once with the forces of Sultan Iltutmish and then with Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud.¹

The play Hammiramadamardana gives the following account of the conflict. 'King Viradhavala of Gujarat is anxious to get the news about Hammira,² who is obviously Amir or the Sultan of Delhi, and who was to begin hostilities against the Mewar king Jayatala (or Jaitra Simha). The latter, however, priding himself on the strength of his sword did not join hands with Viradhavala. The play further relates how the ruthless Mlechchha warriors had entered the Mewar capital and were burning it ... the people out of terror preferred to die at their own hands. The invading army, however, was seized with panic and fled

-
1. Chirwa inscription of Guhila Jaitra Simha, (cited in G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 156); Ghagsa (Udaipur) inscription of V.S. 1322/1265 A.D. (Bhandarkar's List No. 567); Mt. Abu inscription of 1342/1285 A.D. (I.A., Vol. XVI, pp. 347-51; E.I., p. 84; Bhandarkar's List, No. 610; Suri, Hammiramadamardana, (G.O.S., Vol. X), 1920, p. 3.
 2. The play mentions the Muslim ruler as "म्लेच्छहिकार" Mlechchhikara. The term has been suggested to be a Sanskrit rendering of Amir-i-Shikar - title confirmed upon Iltutmish by Sultan Qutbud-Din. (G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 467 and Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 152, fn. 32). Such an identification, however, on phonetical grounds has been rejected. (H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., p. 1021 and A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 159). Since the Sanskrit rendering of Amir is used as Hammira (I.A., Vol. XVIII, p. 16 and Wright, Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, 11, pp. 17-33), Mlechchhikara is surely connected with the term Mlechchha like the other synonym terms such as Turushka for a Turkish Sultan and Surtrana for a Sultan etc.

away, when a spy informed them of ViradhaVala's approach with his forces for the relief of Mewar.¹

From the above account, it seems certain that the Muslim army not only entered Mewar but even succeeded in devastating its capital Nagda (14 miles north of Udaipur). The Chirwa inscription² also refers to the fact that 'in the war with the soldiers of the Sultan, the city of Nagda was destroyed and the governor of that fort was killed in a battle, which took place at Untala, a village near Nagda.

The initial success of the Sultan over Guhilas, however, seems to have been soon nullified, as is indicated

1. Hammiramadamardana, (G.O.S., 1920), Act IV, p. 35. The credit of rescuing Mewar has been solely given to Viradhavala Vaghela since he was the religious patron of Jaya Simha Suri, the writer of the above play. The account is also given with some variations in Merutunga's Prabandhacintamani, (text, p. 103) and Prabandhakosa, (text, p. 117). The contemporary Muslim chroniclers like Nizami and Minhaj made no mention of the event. It has also been suggested that Jayasimha probably based his plot on some incidents which might have taken place when Sultan Iltutmish captured Mendor in 1226 or Malwa in 1234 (H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p..102., fn.8). It is also possible that the present reference was about some raiding party despatched by Sultan Iltutmish towards Gujarat, and which may have been left unrecorded by the Muslim writers. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 159.

2. I.A., Vol. XVI, pp. 345-48.

A., Vol. XVI, pp. 345-48.

"गङ्गा, वह धुर गंगे मने मुहत्रावा मे निवे कुद्या... रलेरुदा, धिरे-
गङ्गा अदादि गागे, जालानि हि-पेवनि यस्परय. ॥"

from the above epigraph.¹ Again, it has been suggested that the silence of the Muslim writers regarding the expedition may perhaps be due to the failure of the campaign and the defeat of the Sultan at the hands of a petty chief.²

Bayana and Thangir:

Like Ajmer and Nagaur, Sultan Iltutmish seems to have been quite successful in annexing north-eastern parts of Rajasthan, notably Bayana³ and Thangir. These places apart from being included among Iltutmish's conquests have been proved to be under the Sultanate of Delhi on the basis of actual discovery of inscriptions.⁴

1. I.A., Vol. XVI, p. 346, Mt. Abu inscription dated V.S. 1342.

"... गुरुनारायण / एतद्-प्रा मन्त्रालय / गुप्तपते / ... २२६१
म/म २४: ३१२/१६:१"

2. A.C. Bannerjee, 'Struggle between Mewar and Delhi in the 14th century', D.R. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, p. 88.

3. For early history of Bayana see Supra, pp. 82-86.

4. The name of Sultan Iltutmish is readable in an Arabic inscription found in the Chausath Khamba mosque at Kaman (in Bharatpur). Since Kaman lies on high road from Delhi to Bayana, it must have been annexed earlier. The mosque appears to have been built out of Hindu temple materials. (Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 54-55). Another inscription on the gateway of Assi Khamba mosque in Bharatpur assigns its erection to Sultan Iltutmish. Ibid., pref- iv.

Bundi :

Bundi remained an independent principality. The earlier attempts under Iltutmish to annex the territory had met with no substantial success, and Malik Nasirud-Din Aitmur, who was incharge of the territories of Ajmer, Sambhar etc., under Iltutmish had died in an unsuccessful attempt to invade Bundi.¹

Many important principalities of Rajasthan had been invaded by the end of Sultan Iltutmish's reign and most of them were entrusted to the charge of Muslim officers. The following Shamsi Maliks held the different principalities of Rajasthan during his period:

- a) Malik Nasirud-Din Aitmur held Siwalik (territory), Ajmer, Lawah, Kasili and Sambhar. He is said to have died fighting in an expedition against the kingdom of Bundi.²
- b) Malik Izzud-Din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan held Nagaur, Mandor and Ajmer.³
- c) Malik Tajud-Din Sanjar Tabar Khan held the territory of Koh-paya (or Mewat, which has very often been combined with Ranthambhor by Minhaj).⁴

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 237.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 236. Sambhar is great Salt Lake in Rajasthan, north of Ajmer. Lawah is to the S.W., in Long. 74, Lat. 25.10. Kasili is written Kassullie in Tod's map. Minhaj, T.N., tr., Raverty, p. 728, fn. 2.

4. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 198.

- d) Malik Tajud-Din Sanjar Kaljaq Khan along with wazir Nizam-ul-Mulk Muhammad Junaidi, conquered the fort of Thangir.¹
- e) Malik Nusratud-Din Tayasi, held Bayana, which was later on transferred to Malik Ikhtiyarud-Din Kargash Khan during the reign of Raziah.²

Apart from these appointments, it has been related above that the principalities of Jalor, Mandor and Ranthambhor too were invaded by the Sultan; but they regained independence subsequently.³

The control over Rajasthan by Iltutmish was sufficiently strong to admit passage of the Caliph's ambassadors in 1228, who passed through Nagaur on their way to Delhi.⁴

It can thus be safely concluded that at the close of Sultan Iltutmish's reign, the territorial expansion of the Muslims was fairly large in Rajasthan. Many of the important places within Rajasthan like Ajmer,⁵ Sambhar,⁶

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 232, tr. 767.

2. Ibid., text, pp. 240, 250; tr. 747.

3. Supra, pp. 95-103

4. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 174; tr. 616.

5. Supra, p. 75.

6. Supra, p. 108.

Bundi,¹ Nagaur,² Mandor,³ Thangir,⁴(Bayana), Koh-Paya⁵ (Mewat), Jalor,⁶ Ranthambhor,⁷ Bari Khatu⁸ (in Marwar), and Bharatpur⁹ etc., are known from the epigraphic, numismatic and literary evidences to have passed under the Muslim control during this period.

THE KINGDOMS OF RANTHAMBHOR
AND JALOR

Ranthambhor:

An account of the establishment of the Ranthambhor kingdom by Gobindaraja, son of Prithviraja III, has already been given; and we have also seen how Gobindaraja's son, Balhana or Vallabhnadeva, was acknowledging the suzerainty of Delhi in 1215, but subsequently gave some reason to Iltutmish to attack him. However, he survived the invasion, and the Chauhan dynasty of Ranthambhor seems to have remained firmly established throughout the thirteenth century.

-
1. Minhaj, T.N., p. 237.
 2. Thomas, Chroniclers of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 78.
 3. Minhaj, T.N., pp. 215, 269 and Supra, pp. 97-99.
 4. Supra, pp. 82-86, 107.
 5. Minhaj, T.N., p. 260.
 6. Supra, pp. 45-46, 99-103.
 7. Supra, pp. 80-82, 95-97.
 8. E.I.A.P.S., 1966, pp. 6-8.
 9. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. II, pp. 761 and Vol. XX, pp. 54-55.

The following list of the rulers of this line is compiled from the Hammiramahakavya and other sources:

- I. Gobindaraja (son of Prithviraja III)
- II. Balahana (written as Valhnadeva in the Manglana inscription and Hammiramahakavya).
- III. Prahladana
- IV. Viranarayana
- V. Vagbhatta.
- VI. Jaitra Simha
- VII. Hammira.¹

The Rajputs during the end of Iltutmish's reign also rose in the neighbourhood of Gwalior under the leadership of Chahar Ajari (identified as Chahadadeva² who after supplanting the Pariharas of Narwar founded the independent Jajapalla dynasty. There is a reference to his rising power in connection with Malik Tayasai's campaigns. It was with great difficulty that the said Malik was able to repulse Chahadadeva's forces and proceed towards Gwalior. Chahadadeva,

1. For the geneology of the Ranthambhor Chauhans up to Hammira, see also Gwalior inscription of Hammira of Ranthambhor dated V.S. 1349/1292 A.D. (Bhandarkar's List, No. 633) and Balvan (Kota) inscription of V.S. 1345/1288 A.D. (text edited by Dashratha Sharma, Hammirayan, int. pp. 104-105).
2. For some of the coins of Chauhan prince read as Chahadadeva, which also include the name of Sanaso-raladeva i.e. Shamsud-Din (Iltutmish) see Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 70

however, is confused with Naharadeva.¹ Chahar Ajari is never mentioned by Minhaj along with Ranthambhor, whose Rana is written as Nahardeva.²

Jalor:

The Chauhan kingdom of Jalor like that of Ranthambhor, saw its foundation during the early phase of the Muslim expansion in Hindustan and fell during the period of mighty Khalji Sultanate. As we have already seen the kingdom of Jalor was an off-shoot of the Chauhans of Nadol,³ and was founded by Kirtipala,⁴ son of Allahana, during the close of the twelfth century, probably before V.S. 1239/1183 A.D., which is the first known date of his son and successor, Samar Simha.

In a bid to establish his sovereignty elsewhere, Kirtipala, laid his hands on the kingdom of Mewar in about V.S. 1236/1180 A.D., when it was ruled over by Guhila

-
1. Dayaram Sahni, E.I., Vol. XII, pp. 223-24, and Cunningham, Coins of Medieval India, p. 91 respectively.
 2. Minhaj, T.N., p. 292, tr. p. 818. Dashratha Sharma, (E.C.D., p. 104) however, identifies Chahadadeva with Vagabhatta of Ranthambhor (see list of Ranthambhor rulers, S.No. V above).
 3. The kingdom of Nadol was founded by Lakha or Lakshmana, sometime before 1039 V.S./983 A.D. See E.I., Vol. XI, p. 67; Nainsi, N.K., "219 मकदु - 715 म 457 1" (Vol. I, p. 100) and Puratanaprabandhasangraha, pp. 101-102.
 4. For his inscriptions, see E.I., Vol. IX, p. 68, Vol. XIII, p. 208.

Samanta Simha. Kirtipala succeeded in occupying his territories for sometime but soon, Kumara Simha,¹ with the help of the Chaulukyas, regained his possessions. The assistance given by the Chaulukyas to Guhilas, in regaining their territories, was a serious blow to Kirtipala and although his ancestors had served as Chaulukya feudatories, Kirtipala seems to have adopted an anti-Chaulukya policy.²

About this time, the Chief of Nadol Kelhana Chauhan, is said to have defeated one Turushka and erected a golden gateway.³ In the same inscription, Kirtipala, the brother of Kelhana, is also stated to have routed a Turushka army.⁴

As has already been noted the epigraphic reference is perhaps to the invasion of Qutbud-Din Aibak, who during his invasion of Gujarat, fought a severe contest with the combined forces of Paramaras and the Chauhans, near Kasahrada village in 1197.⁶ The battle also finds corroboration from the account of contemporary chronicler

1. He was the younger son of Samanta Simha. According to Nainsi, Samanta Simha, at the advise of his nobles, voluntarily relenquished the throne in favour of Kumara Simha. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, pp. 79-80.
2. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 77, for a reference to Kirtipala's invasion on Kiradu, a Chaulukya dependency. Cf. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 144.
3. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 69. "पेरुमल्लनं नय्यत्तन्नायि सोऽथ आये
५३४६०८१२७८ - पत्ताय,"
4. Ibid., vol. XIII, p. 208. "नमो दाताहर्दुमरत्न प्रदे गिरावराज, पंडितो।"
5. Ibid.

who states that there was a severe engagement at the foot of Mt. Abu in 593/1197 A.D.¹

The complete sack of Pali and Nadol by the invading Muslim forces, not only hastened the end of the Chauhans of Nadol,² but possibly gave further strength to the line at Jalor, which had by now been firmly established, under Kirtipala and his successors, Samar Simha and Udaya Simha.³

The ambitious designs of the Jalor chiefs, especially during the period of Udaya Simha, who is described as the lord of Nadol, Jalor, Mandor, Barmer, Surachanda, Rashtroda, Kheda, Ramsen, Srimala, Ratnapura, and Sanchor⁴ were bound to attract the attention of the central authority and sometime after his accession, we find Sultan Shamsud-Din Iltutmish invading the kingdom of Jalor.⁵

1. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411 and Kharataragachhapattavali, text, p. 44.
2. The Nadol kingdom of the Chauhans, after this battle, during the period of Jayata Simha (E.I., Vol. XI, p. 73) survived only up to V.S. 1258/1202 A.D., the last known date of Samanta Simha (Bhandarkar's List, p. 64). After him we know nothing of the Nadol Chauhans.
3. See Sundha Hill inscription, E.I., Vol. IX, p. 73; P.C.Nahar, J.L.-3., Vol. I, p. 257; Bhandarkar's List, No. 561.
4. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 73.
5. For details see Supra, pp. 112-113.

The following names of rulers of the Sonigara Chauhan dynasty of Jalor are known to us from various sources, the last being Rao Kanhada Deva, who died in 1310 A.D. while fighting a Khalji invasion:

- I. Kirtipala (founder)¹
- II. Samar Simha²
- III. Udaya Simha³
- IV. Chachiga Deva⁴
- V. Samanta Simha⁵
- VI. Kanhada Deva.⁶

*

-
1. E.I., Vol. IX, p. 77.
 2. Known from the two inscriptions of V.S. 1239 and V.S. 1256. See E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 53-54 and ibid., p. 55.
 3. He is known from Bhinmal inscriptions of V.S. 1262, 1274, 1305 and 1306. See E.G., Vol. I, prt. 1, pp. 474-76; E.I., Vol. XI, p. 76 and also Kharataragachchhapattavali, pp. 50-51.
 4. Chachiga Deva is known from several inscriptions ranging from V.S. 1319 to V.S. 1333. For the earliest inscription see E.I., Vol. IX, p. 74.
 5. E.I., Vol. XI, p. 61.
 6. Ibid.

CHAPTER * IV

SUCCESSORS OF ILTUTMISH

The death of Sultan Shamsud-Din Iltutmish (1236) put an end to a 'remarkably successful' reign. His contribution towards the establishment of Delhi Sultanate on a firm footing can hardly be under-estimated. The erosion of Sultanate authority in Rajasthan was effectively checked by him by the recovery of the territories annexed earlier and paved way for fuller penetration into Rajasthan.

The period following his death saw a quick successions to the throne and four members of his family becoming Sultans within a decade.

Leaving aside Sultan Raziah, the daughter of Iltutmish, his other three sons proved quite incompetent to shoulder the administrative responsibilities effectively.

Sultan Ruknud-Din Firuz Shah, who succeeded in June, 1235¹, held the throne for only six months² - a period

-
1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 182. Before his accession, he had also acted as a governor of the territories of Budaun and Lahore. *Ibid.*, pp. 181-82.
 2. He died in imprisonment on 18th Rabi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 634/19th November, 1236 A.D., *Ibid.*, text, p. 184.

which was marked only by his "indulgence in low tastes and debaucheries."¹

After the fall of Shah Turkan, the mother of Sultan Ruknud-Din,² Raziah, in supercession of all the claims of the other adult male heirs, succeeded to the throne in A.H. 634/1236 A.D.³ In spite of her great abilities, her brief rule of about four years failed to give any stability to the Turkish empire.

Ranthambhor:

After stabilising her position on the throne, Sultan Raziah despatched her commander, Malik Qutbud-Din Hassan Ghorî against the fortress of Ranthambhor.⁴ The Sultan Iltutmish's invasion of this Chauhan principality had been crowned only by temporary success, and the Chauhans recovering their power had quite possibly extended their sway over the territory up to Mewat - which is often combined with Ranthambhor by Minhaj.⁵ It also seems probable that

-
1. Minhaj, T.N., p. 182. For one of his rare coins in Devanagari referring his name as "सुल्तान रज़िया" see Thomas, The Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 103.
 2. For the details of her intrigues and cruelties see Minhaj, T.N., text, pp. 182-84.
 3. Minhaj states that Sultan Iltutmish had justified her appointment to the throne even during his life time. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 185.
 4. For the earlier history of Ranthambhor, see Supra, pp.
 5. Minhaj, T.N., text, pp. 212, 292; tr. pp. 684-818.

times after the death of Iltutmish, the Chauhans under Vagbhatta¹ laid siege to the fortress itself.

Minhaj states that the Muslim forces stationed at the fortress were in great distress, as a result of which Malik Qutbud-Din Hasan Ghorl was ordered to march against Ranthambhor and it was only at his arrival that the inhabitants of the fortress were rescued.²

Nothing, however, seems to have been achieved, beyond destroying the fort walls. The Turkish garrison was apparently withdrawn. Vagbhatta thus gained control of his principality and is even said to have stationed large armies at different posts along the frontier to keep off the enemies.³

No other significant operation in or around Rajasthan seems to have been undertaken by Raziah, with the exception of one against Gwalior,⁴ and the remaining two years of her reign were mostly occupied with suppressing the rebellions of her governors of Lahore and Tabarindah etc., in the

1. Misread as Bhagwata by Habibullah (Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p. 151). For the correct name see text of the Balvan inscription, Saloka 6, p. 105. (Int. to Hamirayan by Dashratha Sharma).

2. Minhaj, & T.N., text, p. 187; tr. pp. 641-42.

3. Suri, H.M.K., tr., L.A., 1879, p.64.

4. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 188; tr., p. 643-44.

course of which she met her end in 1240.¹

The reign of Sultan Bahram Shah, (21st April, 1240 to 10th May, 1242) was occupied mostly by operation against his own nobles, who plotted to oust him from the throne, and against Mongols, who had occupied Lahore in 1241. Ultimately, after a coup at Delhi, Bahram Shah was assassinated and Alaud-Din Masud Shah son of Ruknud-Din was crowned as king on 10th May, 1242.²

The four-year rule of the Sultan was devoid of any significant event. The all powerful Malik and Amirs wrote secret letters to Nasirud-Din Mahmud to occupy the throne. They imprisoned Masud Shah (10th June, 1246), and he died in confinement.³

Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud:

The major portion of Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud's reign (1246-1265), has been recorded in detail by Minhaj who is our primary authority for the period up to 1259. The Sultan has been painted as a weak and timid ruler, and during the entire period of his reign of twenty years with the exception of a temporary intermission, he

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 190; tr., p. 648.

2. Ibid., pp. 191-97; tr., pp. 649-60.

3. Ibid., p. 201; tr., p. 669.

was guided by Ghiyasud-Din Balban, Ulugh Khan.

Ranthambhor and Mewar:

In the third year of Sultan Mahmud's reign (1247-48) an expedition was organised against Mewar and Ranthambhor. The expedition was led by Ulugh Khan himself. The name of the ruling chief is given as Bahar Deo by Minhaj, which is possibly a corrupt form of Vaghatta. The attempt at 'pacification' was, however, foiled by the Chauhans and in the course of action, one of the generals, Malik Bahaud-Din was killed by the Rajputs.¹ The expedition may be supposed to have been merely punitive in effect, since the Delhi forces returned only with some spoils. The failure of the royal forces, induced Ghiyasud-Din Balban again in 1253, when he held the Iqta of Nagaur, to lead an armed expedition against the same principality. This time too the Raj, 'with his arms and horses', put up a tough resistance and Ulugh Khan had to be satisfied with a safe return with spoils such as horses and captives.² A third attempt was made by Ulugh Khan in 1258-59, when he sent Malik-un Nawab Aibak, against the 'infidels of Ranthambhor'.³

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, pp. 292-93; tr., p. 635.

2. Ibid., text, p. 299.

3. Ibid., text, p. 226.

All these repeated attempts during the reign of Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud, like the earlier ones, were marked by an absence of success which explains the chroniclers' failure to furnish details. The position of the Sultanate was at this time particularly weakened because of the presence of the Mongol power on its north-west.

Depicting the deplorable state of affairs, Minhaj states, 'the rebel inhabitants of Mewat had gathered under their Deo, who committed depredations on the roads, plundered the goods of the Musalmans ... their chief was a Hindu named Malka, a fierce and desperate fellow, who carried off the camels and formented disturbances among the Hindus from the hills to Ranthambhor.'¹ The Mewati chief might have created chaos in alliance with the Ranas of Ranthambhor, who, as has been suggested, probably held sway over Mewat.²

Nagaur:

In the sixth year of his reign (1251-52), Malik

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 313.

2. Cf., A.B.M.Habibullah, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, pp. 153-54.

Izzud-Din Kishlu Khan,¹ who was incharge of the territory of Nagaur,² was ordered by the Sultan to leave Nagaur, in lieu of the fiefs of Multan and Uchh. Kishlu Khan, however, refused to comply with the royal orders as a result of which the Sultan was compelled to proceed towards Nagaur along with Ulugh Khan and some others.

On his arrival at Nagaur, Kishlu Khan, being unable to oppose the royal forces, surrendered the fortress and satisfied himself with the territory of Uchh.³

The Iqta of Nagaur was now placed in charge of Ulugh Khan's brother, Saifud-Din Aibak Kishlu Khan.⁴ The Iqta, however, passed to Ulugh Khan, who established himself

1. Malik Izzud-Din Balban-i-Kishlu Khan, was one of the important nobles of Sultan Iltutmish, whom the latter purchased while at Mandwar fort. Izzud-Din was appointed as Sharabdar during the Sultan's invasion of Gwalior and afterwards, he was given over the Iqta of Baran. He held important position both under Raziah and Bahram Shah. He headed the party of Maliks and Amirs, who had attacked Delhi in 1242-43 to oust Bahram Shah. Kishlu Khan played an important part in the assassination of Bahram Shah and the enthronement of Alaud-Din Masud Shah, in reward for which he was given, the Wilayat of Nagaur. The Malik joined Sultan Masud's forces, when the Mongols invested the fort of Uchh. See Minhaj, T.N., text, pp. 268-69; tr., pp. 775-82.
2. Kishlu Khan had been appointed over the territories of Nagaur, Mandor and Ajmer etc., by Sultan Alaud-Din Masud Shah. See ibid., text, p. 198; tr., pp. 661-62.
3. Ibid., text, pp. 215, 270; tr., pp. 689-781.
4. Ibid., text, pp. 269, 280; tr., pp. 781, 798.

there in the eighth year of Sultan Mahmud's reign.¹ From there he is reported to have successfully raided the territories of 'Ranthambhor, Bundi and Chittor'.²

Bundi and Chittor:

The invasion of the principalities of Bundi and Chittor by Ulugh Khan, during his period of banishment at Nagaur, seems only to have been punitive in nature, since it finds only a casual reference in Minhaj's account.

It is possible that this raid is referred to in the Chirwa inscription of V.S. 1330/1272 A.D., in which it is stated that Ratna, the son of Kshema, who had been appointed talaraksha of Chitrakuta (Chittor), died fighting against an undesignated foe, at the foot of the fortress.³

The success in Mewar of Sultan Iltutmish (who had succeeded in devastating the Guhila capital Nagda) had been nullified subsequently, and the Chirwa and Mt. Abu inscriptions boastfully record the 'curbing of the pride

-
1. Ibid., text, pp. 217, 260, 266, 299, 300; tr., pp. 694, 759, 767, 828 and 830.
 2. Minhaj, T.M., text, p. 299; tr., p. 828. For an inscription referring to the event, during Guhila Jaitra Simha's reign at Chittor, see I.A., 1928, p. 32.
 3. E.I., Vol. XXII, p. 290, verse 26; Shymal Das, Vir Vinod, Vol. I, p. 391.

of the Turushkas'.¹ The Mewar rulers are described as having ruled uninterruptedly over their territory under Jaitra Simha (1213-56)² and Teja Simha (1257-1267)³. It seems therefore, that Balban's raid did not effect the power of these rulers at all.

Bayana:

The principality of Bayana, which had been annexed by Muhammad of Ghor in 1195, remained a part of the Delhi

1. See Supra, p. 167, fn. 1. The statement of Ferishta (T.E., Vol. I, p. 71, tr. Briggs, p. 238) that Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud pursued his brother, Jalalud-Din, when the latter apprehensive of a design against his life in 1247, fled to the hills of Chittor, from where the Sultan being unable to secure him, and so returned, does not seem to be correct. Firstly Minhaj, the detailed narrator of Nasirud-Din's reign does not mention this. His only reference to Chittor is in connection with Ulugh Khan's raid, which he undertook during his banishment to the Iqta of Nagaur sometime in 1253, i.e. about six years after Ferishta's date. Again the event does not find place in any other work that might have served as a source for Ferishta. G.H. Ojha, (U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 469-70) believes that Jalalud-Din and his men might have been provided shelter by Jaitra Simha, whose capital at this time was Chittor. The Sultan might have come into conflict with the Guhila prince who repulsed his attack. Again Minhaj mentions Sirmur instead of Mewar or Chittor hills (T.N., text, p. 423 tr., p. 681) in this context. Ferishta's account is therefore, not worthy of any credence. Ferishta seems to have misread the word 'Santur' in Tabaqat-i-Nasiri as 'Chittor'.
2. See Supra, p/s. 32-35
3. Teja Simha's records range from 1260 to 1267. For the last of his records see Chirwa inscription of V.S. 1324/1267 A.D., J.A.S.B., Vol. LV, prt. 1, pp. 46-47.

Sultanate during the rule of subsequent Sultans.¹

The territory under the administration of Malik Bahaud-Din Tughril, according to Minhaj² became flourishing and prosperous through his efforts. Soon it became a flourishing town and a big centre of trade. Merchants of repute from different parts of Hindustan and Khurasan flocked there. The chronicler further informs us that the fortress being unfit for residence, Malik Tughril founded in the territory of Bayana, the city of Sultankot. He stationed there a strong body of forces and continuously raided the adjoining territories.³

It appears the Malik Bahaud-Din died before his rival Sultan Albak, for he is not mentioned among the Maliks of Sultan Iltutmish. The fort of Tahangarh also must have fallen into the hands of Yadava chief for sometime since Minhaj records the capture of the fortress of Tahangarh as one of the conquests of Sultan Iltutmish.⁴

That Bayana remained a part of Delhi Sultanate during the reign of Sultan Iltutmish is also supported by an undated

1. See Supra, pp. 82-86.

2. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 421; tr., p. 544.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 452, fn. 5; tr., p. 628.

inscription from the Assi Khamba mosque in Bharatpur, wherein Sultan Iltutmish is made out to be builder of the mosque.¹

After the conquest of Gwalior, the Iqta of Bayana, along with Sultankot (earlier founded by Malik Tughril) was entrusted to Malik Nusratud-Din Tayasi.² 'It was governed by Malik Ikhtiyarud-Din Karaksh Khan twice during the reign of Sultan Raziah and Alaud-Din Masud Shah.³ Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud on his accession, assigned the Wilayat of Bayana to Malik Nusrat Khan Bhahaud-Din Shankar Sufi Rumi⁴ who kept a strong contingent at Bayana.⁵

According to Minhaj, Malik Qutlugh Khan held Bayana in A.H. 660/1262 A.D.⁶ Sometimes afterwards, however, it was entrusted again to Malik Nusratud-Dunya-wad-Din Sher Khan Sankar, who held the place up to A.H. 668/1260 A.D.⁷

Since Minhaj, our main source for this period breaks here, nothing is known about any subsequent appointment

1. Cunningham, A.S.I. Vol. XX, pref- iv.

2. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 260.

3. Ibid

4. Ibid., p. 274.

5. Ibid., p. 297.

6. Ibid

7. Ibid.

to this important principality. Fortunately an inscription dated 1st Ranzan, A.H. 669/13th April, 1271 A.D.¹ partially fills the gap. The inscription mentions the name of Balban as well as Nusrat Khan, obviously Nusratud-Din Sher Khan Sankar, who it seems, continued to the post at least up to the date of the epigraph.

Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud's reign of some twenty years was devoid of any notable success in Rajasthan. Apart from Nagaur, Ajmer, Sambhar and Bayana etc., (all of which had earlier been annexed), no fresh territory seems to have been annexed to the Delhi empire. Due to his long periods of inactivity, effective control could not be maintained over many of the conquered territories in Rajasthan and the raids over the kingdoms like Ranthambhor and Chittor proved of no lasting value. The period in fact gave a fresh lease to the Rajput dynasties who all this time remained hostile to Delhi and consolidated their strength.

Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Balban.

Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Balban, who ascended the throne in 1266, was one of the Shamsi slaves and belonged to the band of Turkish group, known as the

1. Edited G.Yazdani, E.I.H., 1937-38, p. 6.

'Forty'.¹ During Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud's reign (1246-66), the real administration of the state was controlled by Balban,² who acted as a guiding spirit behind the Sultan's long rule of twenty years.

Balban's achievements during the full two decades of his own reign as Sultan were more in respect of putting down internal disorder and strife, keeping back the Mongols and suppressing the refractory Hindus of Doab and elsewhere.³ He gave a thorough stability and reorganisation to the administration, which owing to the incompetent sons of Iltutmish and 'over-weening' pride of the Shamsi slaves, had

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 25. Immediately after the death of Iltutmish, the Turkish slaves, i.e. 'The Forty', had obtained much strength and interfered in the state affairs frequently. 'In possessions and display', writes the same chronicler, 'in grandeur and dignity, they viewed with each other, and in their proud vaunts and boasts, every one exclaimed to the other, ' what art thou that I am not, and what wilt thou be that I shall not be?' Ibid., text, p. 28.
2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 26; Isami, E.S., text, pp. 154-65.
3. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 56-57. With his strong and well organised forces, Balban started operations in the vicinity of capital and engaged himself for a whole year in extirpation of the Mewatis by clearing the forests and destroying their hiding places. He is also told to have founded the fortress of 'Gopalgir' as a check against the Mewatis. It is difficult to locate the fortress. Barani (T.F.S., text, p. 57) has
For a supposed identification of this place near Jaipur, see S.A.A. Rizvi, Adi Turk Kaleen Bharat (Hindi), p. 164, fn. 1.

been greatly weakened. As soon as he became king, he did his best to enhance the respect of the crown and gave severest punishments for even the slightest disregard to his authority.

Balban, most of whose reign was occupied in the maintenance of the royal prestige and against Mongol raids, threatening the very foundations of the empire, could hardly devote much time towards the expansion of his territorial limits in Rajasthan. The intimate friends of the Sultan, are once said to have remonstrated to him, that 'Sovereign like Sultan Qutbud-Din and Shamsud-Din conquered Chhain, Malwa, Gujarat, Ujjain and the other distant countries and carried off treasurers and valuables and elephants etc., from the Rais and the Ranas. How is it that with the well disciplined army¹ you do not undertake any distant campaign.'

'You may not have considered the hordes of Chingiz Khan', replied the Sultan, 'if the anxiety which admonishes me that I am the guardian and protector of the Muslims were removed, then I would not stay a single day in the capital and would lead forth an army to capture the Rana and staying at a distant place with the army I possess, I would take all the spirit of the opponents and the enemies of faith.'²

1. Balban engaged his attention first of all towards strengthening his forces.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 50-52.

It was thus only the mongol threat which prevented the Sultan from devoting his full attention towards invading Rajasthan though he is reported to have long cherished the desire of conquering Hindu kingdoms.¹

The only recorded success of Sultan Balban in Eastern Rajputana, seems to be against the Mewatis, who held the territories of Mathura, Gurgaon, Bharatpur and Alwar. According to Minhaj, Balban undertook the task of the extirpation of the Mewatis and gave it the top priority since the Mews, taking advantage of the weak and inefficient successors of Sultan Iltutmish, had become rebellious. Usually they attacked the capital at night and plundered the people. The Mews had pillaged the Suburbs of the city and settled where in large numbers. As a result of this trouble the western gates of Delhi were closed soon after the evening prayers.²

With his strong forces, Balban spent a whole year in the extirpation of the Mewatis, by clearing the forests and destroying their hiding places. To put a permanent

1. Relying on the strength of his army, Balban is reported to have boastfully claimed that even six or seven thousand of Delhi soldiers were sufficient to encounter about 2 lacs of the forces of the Rais and the Ranag. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 52.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 56-57.

check to their menace, he founded 'Gopalgir' and garrisoned it.¹

Memo:

The Mt. Abu inscriptions, dated V.S. 1342/1285 A.D. while giving the geneology of the Mewar chiefs, records about Samar Simha as 'the incarnation of the primeval Boar, whose sword, like the steaming tusk raised high in a moment, the Gurjara land (i.e. western Rajasthan or Gujarat) from the sea of the Turushkas.'²

This obviously refers to an armed expedition of the Muslims against Gujarat in which the reigning Guhila chief Samar Simha might have helped the Gurjara chief (Sarangdeva, 1275-95 A.D.)³, and saved his territories from a complete sack. The event must have occurred sometime before 1285 during the reign of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Balban.

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, pp. 56-57. "در گوپال گری حصار بنا فرمود"
2. I.A., Vol. XVI, p. 347 "गुर्जर गह्वरस्य मन्त्रिः प्रह्लादः सन् राजा हिन्दुः"।
For another earlier record of the Guhilas boastfully referring to the defeat of the Turushka, see Ghagsa village (near Chitter) inscription dated V.S. 1322/1265 A.D.
"गुर्जर गुर्जर गामस्य प्रह्लादः सन् राजा हिन्दुः, यज्ञे च गोप
गोपः स प्रह्लादः सन् हिन्दुः"
3. His inscriptions range from V.S. 1332 (I.A., Vol. XXI, p. 276) to V.S. 1350 (Poona Orientalist, Vol. III, p. 69.).

It is also possible that Mt. Abu might have formed a part of the Gujarat kingdom since Samar Simha claims to have rescued the land of Gurjaras from the Turushkas in 1285. However, from the Pattanarayana inscription¹ it appears that Paramara Pratap held this place and later on Visla ruled there as Sarang Deva's feudatory.² It is thus possible that Samar Simha being deprived of a just reward, might have come to terms with the Muslims when Ulugh Khan attacked Gujarat.³

Samar Simha was a contemporary of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Balban, Jalauddin and Sultan Alauddin Khalji. Although Persian chroniclers are silent about this event,⁴ The testimony of the inscription leaves little doubt about a Guhila-Muslim conflict or at least the claims of independence set forth by the Guhila chief.

Marwar:

According to epigraphic evidence, Rao Sihaji, the founder of Rathor principality of Marwar, died fighting against the Muslim forces when the latter attacked Pali

-
1. See I.A., Vol. XXI, p. 276;
Poona Orientalist, Vol. II, p. 69.
 2. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat,
p. 184, fn. 74.
 3. Amir Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 50; Barani,
T.F.S., text, p. 251.
 4. Ibid.

in 1273.¹ Since there is no mention of Balban's attack on the Rathors in Barani's account, the attack might have been led by one of his governors posted at Nagaur or Mandor.²

Although there is no direct evidence of Balban's hold over the principality of Marwar, a number of Muslim inscriptions found in Nagaur and Khatu etc., prove that the region around the find-spots of these inscriptions was under his control. An Arabic inscription in Bari Khatu bearing the date 11th Jamadi, II A.H. 666/27th February, 1267 A.D., although fragmentary furnishes valuable information about Sultan Ghiyasud-Din's control of the region. The extent portion of the epigraph mentions a noble

-
1. Bithu (Pali in Jodhpur) inscription of Kartik badi 12, V.S. 1330/Monday 9th October, 1273 A.D. See P.R. (W.C.), 1911-12, p. 57; I.A., Vol. XL, p. 181.
 2. For details of Marwar's relations with the Sultans of Delhi, see M.S. Ahluwalia 'Marwar and the Sultans of Delhi - A Study based on epigraphic evidence', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, 1968, pp. 51-54. According to traditional accounts preserved in Jodhpur Khyat (Vol. I, p. 54, cited in G.H. Ojha, History of Rajputana, Vol. IV, part 1, p. 173), when Nawab Haji Khan attacked Mahoba in V.S. 1342/1267 A.D., with an army of 40000 soldiers, Rathor Rao Zalim Singh resisted the attack and killed Haji Khan. Ojha suggests this Haji Khan to be a governor of either Jalor or Nagaur. The entire legend, however, seems to be baseless. Firstly 'Nawab' is a late 16th century term for the Mughal Governor. Secondly, the *title* of Haji Khan was held by no noble of the Sultanate. Again it is too early for a Rathor chief to bear an Arabic name like ~~hazem~~ Zalim. It is possibly an 18th century story and hence deserves no credence.

'Saifud-Daulat Wad-Din Malik-i-Malukish-Shar - Ahmad as Sultani'.¹

It may also be mentioned here that by this time, the Chishti Silsilah established in Ajmer had spread in Marwar region with its seat at Nagaur. According to some documents² found recently, Sheikh Hamidud-Din Sufi, (ob. 673/1276 A.D.) a distinguished disciple of Khalifa of Khwaja Muinud-Din Chishti of Ajmer, lived like a peasant at Sawal, a small village in Nagaur. His family carried on conversation in Hindvi.

It is further reported that touched by his penitence and poverty, the Muqta of Nagaur, offered a plot of land and some cash to him. The matter was reported to the Sultan when Hamidud-Din did not accept the government gift. The Sultan, therefore, sent 500 silver tankas with a firman conferring a village on Shaikh. The royal gift also, like the earlier one, was not accepted.³

-
1. I.A.A.R., 1958-59, p. 64. Two other undated inscriptions from the same place have been proved to be of 13th century on the grounds of paleography and thus corroborate Muslim hold over the region during the period. Ibid., 1962-63, pp. 60-61 and A.R.I.E., 1962-63.
 2. Appended to a Mss. copy of Sararus-Sadur, preserved in the Habib Ganj collection of M.Azad Library, Aligarh. For details see K.A. Nizami, 'Some documents of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq', Medieval India - A Miscellany, Vol. I, pp. 301-313.
 3. K.A.Nizami, op.cit., p. 304.

It may thus be stated that Marwar region had been efficiently governed through a number of administrative officers appointed there and that by the last quarter of the thirteenth century, quite a large number of Muslims, including saints and scholars had peacefully settled in various parts of western Rajasthan.

Dungarpur:

The principality of Bagar now known as Dungarpur, is situated to the S.W. of Mewar. Several inscriptions found from this territory indicate that the territory was in possession of the Paramaras¹ at least up to V.S. 1166/1109 A.D., after which nothing is known until the Guhila chiefs occupied the area in the last quarter of the twelfth century.

For the first known ruler Guhila Samanta Simha, two inscriptions dated V.S. 1228 and 1236/1172 and 1179 A.D. have been found from village Jagat (in Chhappan district), lying on Mewar Dungarpur border and village Solaj (in Dungarpur) respectively.² This indicates that the Guhila

-
1. The first known paramara inscription from Bagar is dated V.S. 1116 and last of V.S. 1166/1109 A.D. For details, see G.H.Ojha, D.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 23-24.
 2. For text of these inscriptions see Ibid., p. 35 in 1 and 2. See also Abu inscription of V.S. 1342/1285 A.D., which mentions the loss of Mewar during Samanta Simha and its reoccupation by his successor Kumar Simha, I.A.A., Vol. XVI, p. 349.

Samanta Simha must have occupied the region before V.S. 1228. This is partially supported by Nainsi who states that Samanta Simha occupied the territory of Baroda¹ (in Bagar). Traditional accounts preserved in Nainsi Khyat, further state that the territory of Bagar was held by one Malik Chorsi,² probably a Muslim nominee, who is further said to have been killed by Maharawal Sihad Deo,³ the third in succession to the throne of Dungarpur. (V.S. 1277-1306/1221-1250 A.D.). However, according to Nainsi, it was Samanta Simha who occupied Bagar by killing Chorsi.⁴

Since there is a discrepancy of about 42 years between the first and the third rulers of Dungarpur and there is no contemporary evidence of Turkish penetration into Bagar, it is difficult to accept either of the statements.⁵

*

-
1. Nainsi, N.K., text, pp. 80-84.
 2. Ibid.
 3. K.S.Erskine, Gazetteer of Dungarpur State, 1908, p. 132.
 4. Nainsi, N.K., text, pp. 80-84. "वैद्यम चोराम्-सिमा मारुत... गुप्तकाल-सि दृष्टम् म अफर राजधानि 38 29वीं" Cf. Rajaprasasti Mahakavya, Sarga 3; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, pp. 203-206; K.S.Erskine, Gazetteer of Dungarpur State, pp. 131-32; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 274, 288, all of which assign the foundation of Dugarpur in the beginning of the 14th century, after the sack of Chittor. However, the actual discovery of inscriptions of Guhila Samanta Simha and his successors from Dungarpur, make the above statements dubious.
 5. G.H.Ojha, is inclined to accept Nainsi's version in full. D.R.I., Vol. I, p. 39.

CHAPTER * VJALALUD-DIN FIRUZ KHALJI
AND RAJASTHAN

Jalalud-Din Firuz Khalji, who ascended to the throne in A.H. 689/1290 A.D.,¹ after a coup d'etat had occupied an important status among the other Amirs and exercised great influence in the army as Ariz-i-Mamalik. The Khalji usurption of the throne, in view of the contemporary chroniclers Isami³ and Barani,⁴ came as a surprise to the people and a shock to the Turkish Amirs.

The Khalji regime, however, proved much stronger than the earlier Turkish rule. A new wave of invasions and conquests began, which ended only when practically the whole of India had been brought under the sway of Delhi.

-
1. Khusrau, M.F., text, pp. 6-7; Yahya, T.M.S., text, pp. 61-62. Barani gives 688 A.H. (T.F.S., text, p. 175). This is wrong since we have the coins of Shamsud-Din Qaimas dated A.H. 689.
 2. Ariz-i-Mamalik - the highest officer of Diwan-i-Ariz or military, who controlled all military activities including recruitment, inspection and supply etc.
 3. Isami, F.S., text, p. 209.
 4. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 175-76.

Ranthambhor:

About one year after his accession (A.H. 690/ 1291 A.D.) Sultan Jalalud-Din Khalji marched with large force towards Ranthambhor.¹ The contemporary ruler of Ranthambhor during Sultan Jalalud-Din's reign was Rana Hammira Deo Chauhan, son and successor of Jaitra Simha, who was seated on the throne of Ranthambhor during the life time of his father.² All the Muslim and the Chauhan chroniclers unanimously agree that Hammira possessed many qualities of head and heart, was endowed with great physical might and 'exceeded his ancestors in pride.'³

Taking advantage probably of the trouble following the death of Balban (change of dynasty at Delhi) and the sense of security, which Hammira enjoyed in the hilly fortress of Ranthambhor, he is said to have started war-like operations in the territories around him. He is said to have possessed 12,000 horses, numerous soldiers and elephants.⁴

-
1. Amir Khusrāu, (M.F., text, p. 23) gives 18th Rabi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 689, corresponding to 21st March, 1291 A.D. Barani, (T.F.S., text, pp. 212-13) gives A.H. 689 which is not correct.
 2. Suri, H.M.K., tr., I.A., 1879, p. 64.
 3. Isami, F.S., pp. 270-71, 272-273. Khusrāu, Dewal Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 65, tr., Mohammad Habib, Khazain-ul-Futuh, tr., p. 41, fn. 2.
 4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 77.

9 The author of Hammiramahakavya mentions a Digvijaya undertaken by Hammira sometime in 1291. This might be taken as a number of raids from time to time, some of which also find support in the Balvan inscription of V.S. 1345/1288 A.D.¹ Moreover, it seems that whereas Jaitra Sinha had paid tribute to Delhi, Hammira withheld it.²

As the Khalji army advanced, a party was despatched in advance from Hammira's camp in order to obtain information about the enemy. The Muslims came across a Chauhan contingent of 500 horses. In the battle that ensued, the Muslims took the lead, killing about seventy Hindus and making the others to flee. The initial victory encouraged the Sultan, who on the following day sent about 1000 soldiers under reputed generals Malik Khurram Vakildar, (Ariz-i-Mamalik), Kurbeg Azam, Malik Qutlugh Tighin, Amir Narnaul, Ahmad Sarjandar, Mir Shiqar Ahmad, and Abazi Akhur Beg to attack Chhain.³

1. E.I., Vol. XIX, p. 49; Dashratha Sharma, Int. to Hammirayan, pp. 104-05.

2. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 9, Shlokas 102-103 read:

"सुतस्यैवमयुः पुरा जितं हिंस्रं मयं पुरा ।
 पदं न मया दत्तं मुने चपुः जितं मयं ॥
 हस्तं न मया नम्यं पुरा नम्यं नम्यं नम्यं ।
 दत्तं दत्तं नम्यं नम्यं नम्यं नम्यं ॥"

i.e. Jaitra Sinha used to pay us tribute, but this son of his not only does not pay the tribute but takes every opportunity of showing the contempt in which he holds us.

3. Khusrau, M.K., text, pp. 25-26.

Chhain (often read as Jhain), a place which acquired considerable prominence, has not been properly identified so far. But it is certainly the modern 'Chhan' a few miles south-east of Ranthambhor, at the bottom of a pass. This was the Chhain Pass, which, according to Abul Fazl, led to Ranthambhor. The location of Chhain here given is made definite by the fact that Chhain was a Pargana in the Mughal Sarkar of Ranthambhor, and the villages recorded under it in Rajasthani arsatthas of the eighteenth century are still found around it.¹

Hammira, being informed of these proceedings, sent his general Sahni,² with a force, of 10,000, to check the further advance of the royal forces. However, the general, was killed in the battle that ensued in the valley of Chhain.³

-
1. I owe the identification of Chhain to Mr. S.P. Gupta, who has been working on the Arsatthas.
 2. He seems to be the 'Sainani Bhim Singh' of Hammira-mahakavya, text, Canto 9, Shloka 110. However, he is stated therein to have died fighting against the forces of Sultan Alaud-Din. According to Khusrau he was like a steel mountain and with a force of 40,000 men under him, he had invaded far off places like Malwa and the Gujarat. Khusrau, M.E., text, pp. 27-28.
 3. Ibid., text, p. 30. S.A.A. Rizvi, Khalji Kaleen Bharat (Hindi), p. 153 reads that 'Sahni fled away', this is wrong. The text reads:
 "چوں میراں تنگ شد باہم نیادر - درساہنی دریں درگرد"

and this is corroborated in Hammiramahakavya, Shloka 149, Canto 9

tr., L.A., 1879, p. 26.

Chhain was then easily captured. Next day the Sultan visited the place of the Rajput chief and was struck with its grace and decorative art. Its walls were shining like mirrors and were studded with the sandal wood. The Sultan also visited the temples and gardens. The religious zeal of the Sultan, however, could hardly tolerate the existence of images there, and soon he ordered the demolition of all the idol temples.¹

The occupation of Chhain encouraged the Sultan to besiege the fortress of Ranthambhor itself. The Rana along with the other Rawats, is said to have taken refuge inside the walls of the fortress and prepared himself to stand the siege.² The Sultan ordered the use of war engines like Maghrabi, sabat, and gargach etc.³, in a bid to reduce the fortress,⁴ but finding all his attempts of no use, abandoned the attempt.

Malik Ahmad Chap, at this juncture, sincerely advised the Sultan to 'attain his object' (of reducing

1. Khusrav, M.E., text, pp. 31-32.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 213.

3. Maghrabi:- Probably a machine to throw fiery objects.

Sabat :- A shielded way.

Gargach :- A moving platform, raised up to the level of the fort, to attack or storm the fort.

4. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 213.

the fortress) and 'not to allow the Rana to become proud,' but the Sultan preferred a 'disgraceful' retreat under the pretext that 'he did not value even ten such forts above the single hair of a Mussalman'.¹ Ahmed Chap made another protest, but the king with tears in his eyes and a sentimental speech silenced the council and firmly ordered the retreat.

According to the Tughluq Nama, when the Sultan was busy in the siege of Ranthambhor, Rana Hammira, sent a special guard out of the fort, which attacked the besiegers with such intensity that only Tughluq Khan could save the situation.² The reference to the furious attack may at best partly explain the cause of the Sultan's retreat from the fort of Ranthambhor, and if 'Sainani Bhim Singh'³ of the Hamiramahakavya* (who fought against the Muslim forces) may be taken as Saini of Khusrau's Miftah-ul-Futuh,⁴ and the Shakaindra⁵ as Sultan Jalalud-Din Khalji, it seems

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 213-14.

2. Khusrau, Tugh.N., text, p. 138.

3. L.A., 1879, p. 66.

4. Khusrau, M.F., text, pp. 26, 29, 30.

5. Shakaindra ($\frac{शका}{सक}$) means (the kings of Sakas'. Shakaindra as a Muslim king has also been found in a number of Sanskrit inscriptions of pre-Khalji period and it appears to mean a Sultan and not 'Sikandar', the title adopted by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji later on.

certain that the Sultan was obliged to retreat under some or the other pretext.¹

It was not long after the execution of Siddi Maula, that the Sultan (probably to put an end to his previous humiliation) undertook another expedition against Chhain and the fortress of Ranthambhor.² The Rana, however, remained secure in his fortress and retained his independent status at least for some more years until Sultan Alaud-Din finally captured it in 1301 A.D.³

Campaign against Marwar:

Tradition relates about Sultan Jalalud-Din Firuz Shah's contest with Rao Asthan (1273-92), the second Rathor chief of Marwar line. It is stated that on hearing the approach of Muslim forces under Jalalud-Din in 1291, near Pali, (in Marwar), Rao Asthan, rushed from his seat at Kheda and after a tough contest, the latter died along with 140 men on Vaisakh Sudhi, 15, Samvat 1348, or 15th April,

1. Khusrav, M.F., text, p. 34; Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 213-14.
2. Barani says that the second expedition was sent against Chhain which was laid waste. (T.F.S., p. 220). Although it does not appear from the statement of Barani that the Sultan went beyond Chhain, it seems that the original target of the Sultan was Ranthambhor. Since Barani does not state if anything was achieved beyond destroying Chhain, it may be safely assumed that the resistance offered at Chhain may have led to the abandonment of the project as in the previous case.
3. See Infra, Chapter on 'Khalji Imperialism', Occupation of Ranthambhor.

1291 A.D.¹

The Vividhatirthakalpa similarly speaks of Sultan Firuz's expedition in V.S. 1348/1291 A.D., when he is stated to have advanced as far as Sanchor and Jalor,². He is said to have been forced to retreat at the approach of Sarangdhara Bhagela, to the help of the Chauhans of that territory.³

However, the only possible expedition of Sultan Jalalud-Din in Rajasthan during the years 1292-95, apart from Chhain, seems to be against Mandor, which is also corroborated by epigraphic evidence.⁴

*

-
1. Reu, Marwar Ka Itihas (Hindi), Vol. I, p. 44, fn. 4. The invasion is supported by a fragmentary slab dated 692 A.H./1293 A.D. in the Mandor Mosque, said to have been build by Sultan Jalalud-Din. Ibid., p. 15.
 2. Jalor and Sanchor, during Jalalud-Din Khalji, were ruled over by Chauhan Samanta Simha (1283-1306).
 3. Singhi Jain Grantha Mala, p. 30 (cf. Dashratha Sharma, P.L.H.C., 1951, p. 329).
 4. See Supra, fn. 1

CHAPTER * VI

KHALJI IMPERIALISM

Allaud-Din Khalji's occupation
of Ranthambhor.

The relations of Delhi Sultanate with Ranthambhor Chauhans entered a new phase with the accession of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.¹ After having firmly established himself on the throne of Delhi, Sultan Alaud-Din, at the advice of Qazi Alaud-ul-Mulk,² decided to reduce the adjoining principalities. Muslim chroniclers like Barani, Khusrau and Isami provide a detailed account of the first campaign of Sultan in Rajasthan. According to all the chroniclers, the Sultan occupied the fort with great blood-shed and much difficulty. The Sultan slew Rana Hammira Deo and the Neo-Muslim (Mongols) who had taken shelter with him.³

-
1. Sultan ascended the throne on 22 Zil-Hijjah, 695 A.H. corresponding to 20th October, 1296 A.D. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 12, tr. Habib, p.7. Barani does not give the date.
 2. Alau-ul-Mulk is reported to have advised the Sultan to make all the Iqlims of Hindustan loyal and feudatories. Barani, T.E.S., p. 260.
 3. Barani, T.E.S., text, pp. 272-283; Khusrau, K.E., text, pp. 53-59; Ibid, Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, text, pp.65-66; Isami, F.S., text, pp. 252-55 and 271-77; Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 77; Ferishta, text, pp. 106-108.

The account of Muslim chroniclers is also supported by a number of non-Persian sources, including some bio-graphical accounts of the Chauhan chief, which provide a graphic account of the struggle of Hammira against the Sultan and the ultimate fall of the Ranthambhor principality.¹

The Chauhan power had increased immensely by the time of Khalji occupation of throne of Delhi. It has already been stated that the kingdom of Ranthambhor probably enjoyed the status of a tributary state since the rule of Sultan Iltutmish. According to Suri, Hammira had with-held the tribute which his predecessors had been regularly paying to the Sultanate of Delhi.²

This was possible because of the unsettled conditions at Delhi soon after Balban's death, which apparently resulted in the indifference of the Sultan towards the

1. Among the several non-Persian writers mention may be made of Suri, Hammiramahakavya, Cantos, 5-13; Bhandav Vyas, Hammirayan (V.S. 1538); Vidyapati, Prurshapariksha, (V.S. 1496) text, pp. 52-53; Bhat Khen, Raja Hammira de Kavir, (V.S. 1706) text, pp. 60-66. Mundhra Rajrupa, Hammira Hathala ke Kavir, (V.S. 1798); Nainsi, H.K., Vol. I, p. 16 and Vol. II, p. 493; Mahesh, Hammira Raso and Chandrasekhara, Surjanacharita (all cited in Hammirayan).
2. Suri, H.M.K., Canto, 9, verses 102-103; Vyas, Hammirayan, text, p. 5, verse 45.

Chauhan principality. However, an important reason also lay in Hammira's giving shelter to the rebel neo-Muslims (Mongols) under the leadership of Muhammad Shah¹ which was undoubtedly a challenge to the central authority.

The Futuh-us-Salatn of Isami provides us details about the mutiny at Jalor and consequent escape of Muhammad Shah and his associates to the camp of Rana Hammira.

Apart from this, the strategic importance of the fort and the failure of earlier attempts to capture the fort, also partly accounted for the Sultan's invasion.

-
1. Isami, F.S., text, pp. 252-255. The substance of Isami's version is that 'Kamizi' Muhammad Shah, 'Kabhru', 'Yaljak' and 'Barq', who were Mongols and had now become Mussalmans, were ready to assassinate Ulugh Khan, the brother of Alaud-Din Khalji, when their demand for the share of booty (captured during Gujarat campaign) which was refused by him. Ulugh Khan in alliance with Nusrat Khan attacked the rebels, Yaljak and Barq fled to Rai Karan, while Kamizi Muhammad Shah and Kabhuru proceeded towards the fort of Ranthambhor. See also Barani, T.F.S., pp. 252-53 and 283 and Khusrau K.F., text, p. 55. After a comparison of the names of the rebels given by Isami with those of Suri, it seems that Mahimasahi (*महिमासाहि*) is Muhammad Shah, Gabhruk (*गब्रुक*) is Kabhru (*काब्रु*) () Suri mentions two more names Vichar and Tichar (*विचार तिकार*) who were probably Yaljak and Barq of Isami. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 10, verse 21. See also Vidyapati, Purusapariksa, text, p. 52, cf., Hammirayan, Appdx, 111.

The Sultan commanded Ulugh Khan, then governor of Bayana to proceed towards Ranthambhor.¹ The latter marched immediately with an army of 10,000 horsemen,² in A.H. 699/1299-1300 A.D.³ Nusrat Khan, the Muqti of Kara was also instructed to collect all the forces from the adjoining territories and join Ulugh Khan in this expedition.⁴

The combined forces under Ulugh Khan and Nusrat Khan invaded Chhain - the gateway to Ranthambhor. The route followed by Muslim commanders seems to be the same as was during Sultan Jalalud-Din's attack on Ranthambhor.⁵ According to Suri, Hammira himself being engaged in Munivrata, despatched his generals Bhim Singh and Dharam Singh to oppose the royal forces. The Chauhan forces are said to have

1. Barani, T.F.S., p. 272; Khusrau, Dewal Rani Khizr Khan, p. 64; Isami, F.S., p. 270; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 77; Suri, H.M.K., Canto 9, verse 101; Vyas, Hammirayan, p. 13, verse, 118.
2. Khusrau, Dewal Rani Khizr Khan, p. 64; Suri mentions that Ulugh Khan commanded 80,000 horse. (H.M.K., Canto 9, verse 106). This might have included the army despatched under Nusrat Khan and other Muqtis also.
3. Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 50. Yahya puts the event in the same year. (T.M.S., p. 77).
4. Barani, T.F.S., p. 272; Suri, H.M.K., Canto 11, verse 7.
5. I.e. via Lohravat, Chandawal, Rewari, Narnaul, Biawah and Sandy tract of Rajasthan after which Ranthambhor was reached. Khusrau, M.F., pp. 25-26.

gained victory over the royal forces, but it was nullified by a subsequent ambushade.¹

It is evident from the version of the Muslim chroniclers that the royal forces under Ulugh Khan and Nusrat Khan failed to capture the fort of Ranthambhor because of the tough resistance offered by the Chauhans. The success of Muslim commanders seems to have been limited only to the capture of Chhain and its adjoining territories.²

1. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 9, verses 110 ff.
The pro-Chauhan chronicler further states that in an encounter near (Varnansa), Bhim Singh defeated the Muslim forces. However, Ulugh Khan followed the Chauhan forces secretly and while passing through 'Handuwat Pass', (probably Loharavat of Khusrau), the Chauhan commander, in the pride of a victory gained, ordered the musical instruments captured from the Muslim forces to be sounded. The Muslim army (considering it a call to assemble) poured, from all sides into the pass and in the fresh battle that ensued, Bhima was killed and the Muslims gained a complete victory. (*ibid.*, Canto 9, verses 130-150). However, it is difficult to give any credence to the story. At the most it may be based on an actual ambush of Chauhan forces by the Delhi army, who possibly left their war equipment and retreated only to wait for a suitable opportunity to attack.

2. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 277. "نفر دیریت جہاں رات اند دعار تافتنہ بودند و در لغت آوردہ"

According to the unconfirmed version of Suri Dharam Singh, the surviving general of Hammira was blinded by the Chauhan chief because of his failure to resist the Muslims. Dharam Singh, although badly treated, regained his former status testfully. In a bid to take revenge of his insult, he succeeded in ousting a loyal and faithful servant of Hammira named Bhoja whereupon the latter found shelter with the Sultan. (Suri, H.M.K., Canto 9, verses, 156-188 and Canto 10, verses 1-11). Ferishta mentions only the name of Rammalla, the minister of Hammira who betrayed Hammira and went over to the side of the Sultan. See Ferishta, T.F.S., text, p. 108.

Isami furnishes some details about the messages exchanged between the Rai and the Muslim Commander which also find confirmation from the Chauhan accounts. Ulugh Khan sent an ambassador to Hammira with a message to surrender the rebels or be prepared for a war. Hammira, after consultations with his ministers, is said to have finally decided to ignore the message and prepared himself for the defence.¹

The failure of negotiations resulted in the investment of the fort. It is stated that when the news of the Muslim advance was conveyed to Hammira, the latter despatched his brother Virama who repelled the Muslim forces.² Khusrau gives only one major attack on Ranthambhor in which

چو پیش الخان دیران پند خواں نام ناپند

1. Isami, F.S., p. 273 and Suri, H.M.K., Canto, 11, verses 25-29. Suri gives the name of ambassador as Molhan and adds an offer to Hammira - the choice between paying one ~~xxxxxxx~~ hundred thousand gold mohars, 4 elephants, 300 horses and giving his daughter in marriage to Alaud-Din, or giving up to him the four insubordinate Mongol chiefs. Leaving much room for exaggeration, it is certain that a peace treaty was offered to Hammira, which the latter rejected. See also Hammirayan, text, p. 16, verse 143 and Vidyapati, Purushapariksha, text, p. 54.
2. The failure of the Muslim commanders in capturing the fort, and the death of Nusrat Khan during siege operations, which resulted in an appeal to the Sultan for sending reinforcements, explain the underlying truth in Chauhan chronicler's version. Ferishta adds 'The Rajputs marched out of the fortress and forced the Muslim army to fall back on Chhain with heavy losses.' Ferishta, T.F., text, p. 106.

Ulugh Khan was joined by Sultan Alaud-Din before the final capture of the fortress.¹ The events, however, suggest a number of skirmishes under the Muslim commanders, failure in capturing the fort, appeal of help to the Sultan, a long siege under the supervision of Sultan and the ultimate fall of the fort.

The main camp of the Muslim army was set up close to the fort² while the forces³ ^{were} engaged in besieging the fort which was three parsangs in circumference.³ The Muslims adopted a number of devices like preparing of pashib⁴ and gurgach⁵ and throwing of maghrabi⁶ stones to reduce the fort.⁷

During the siege operations, Nusrat Khan was wounded, when a shot from a maghrabi discharged from within the fort walls hit him and he died after some days.⁸ The situation

1. Khusrav, K.F., pp. 53-59.

2. Isami, F.A., p. 274. "سپہ خیمہ زد گرد گرد حصار ہی کدہ پر روز و شب کارزار۔"

3. Khusrav, Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, p. 65.

"حصاری دور دیوارش سے دستک" (1 parsang - 3 miles)

4. 'Pashib': A mud platform erected parallel to the fort walls to discharge fire and stone etc.

5. For 'Gurgach': See Supra, p. 14 fn.3.

6. For 'Maghrabi': See Supra, p. 14 fn.3.

7. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 277.

8. Barani, T.F.S., p. 272. Bhandav Vyas corroborates it and mentions that Nusrat Khan was wounded near Navlakhi gate

"नवलखी गेट पर, ५५३" Hammirayan, verse 172.

demanding central help and Ulugh Khan appealed to the Sultan to come to his rescue.¹

Sultan Alaud-Din being informed about the developments at Ranthambhor himself proceeded there.² The investment of the fort was now carried on with fresh vigour. The battle raged day and night. Huge gurgacha were constructed. However, the attempts to reduce the fort were continually made *futile* by the garrison. The trenches which the Muslim forces filled with wood were burnt by the Hindus at night.³ The resistance continued for one whole year.⁴

Meanwhile the Sultan's long absence created some troubles at Delhi. The situation was exploited by Haji Maula,

-
1. Isami, F.S., p. 276; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 77.
 2. The Sultan on his way to Ranthambhor, halted for sometime at Tilpat, where he was fatally attacked by his nephew Aqat Khan. This resulted in the abandonment of the project for sometime. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 272-73.
 3. Isami, F.S., p. 276. Suri also states that 'the enemy by working underground had prepared mines and had attempted to throw over a part of ditch a temporary bridge of wood and grass carefully covered with earth. The Rajputs destroyed this bridge with their cannon and pouring burning oil into mines, destroyed those who were working underground. At the same time he (Sultan) was greatly harrassed by the rain which now fell into torrents.' Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verses 39-47.
 4. Isami, F.S., p. 276. Amir Khusrau states that the siege continued from the month of Rajab to Zikad (i.e. March to July) A.H. 700. (Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 53). At another place he states that the inmates of the fort continued to throw stones until the end of Shaban. Ibid.

who taking advantage of Sultan's absence, made an attempt to usurp the throne.¹ The insurrection was, however, crushed and Sultan remained at Ranthambhor with a firm determination to capture it.

The siege operations were now pressed with renewed vigour. The moat which had earlier been filled with grass and wood, was filled with sand. A parallel platform to the fort was prepared and the besiegers fought for another three weeks.² In the meantime, it is reported by the Chauhan chroniclers that Alaud-Din won over Ratipala - Hammira's commander by alluring him with the promise of bestowing Ranthambhor upon him after its capture.³

1. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 278-80. Barani mentions that Haji Maula was instigated to an insurrection when he learnt that the royal forces were under Alaud-Din tired of the long siege. A large number of soldiers were being killed daily and the civil as well as military officials were fed up with the Sultan's oppression.

”در اندکی لشکر در محاصره و در ششماه کشته شدن ایشان در محاصره گری به قوا تر شدند که خلق بنایت تنگ آمده است و از خوف دست دراز ساله سلطان یک آدمی را از لشکر جدا شدن کن نیست“

Ibid., text, p. 279.

2. Isami, F.S., p. 273.

3. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verses 70-80. The Chauhan chronicle suggests a chain of sedition among Hammira's followers. Ratipala is said to have poisoned the mind of Rammalla by informing him falsely that the king's mind was greatly prejudiced against the latter. The sedition of Rammalla is also mentioned by Ferishta;

”و چنانچه راکم از راجه ندور جدا شده بودند شلی غل و زیر و غیره همه را بقتل رسانیده“
H.M., text, p. 108. i.e. 'the king commanded Rammalla, the raja's minister, who had come over to the king with a strong party during the siege, should with all his followers, be put to death.' *Ibid*, tr., Vol. I, pp. 343-44.

Meanwhile, the long siege resulted in a severe famine inside the fort. Amir Khusrau, probably an eye witness to these events, informs us that 'even a grain of rice could not be had for two grains of gold.¹' The tide now definitely turned against Hammira, who being harrassed by the repeated, continuous and vigorous attacks of the Muslims, as a last resort, lighted a funeral pyre and made all his wives and family perish in it.²

The gates of the fort were thrown open and Hammira came out along with his remaining followers.³ In a close and hand-to-hand fight, Hammira fell along with all his companions, including Muhammad Shah.⁴

-
1. Khusrau, K.E., p. 53; Cf. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verses, 136-138. Suri states that Hammira's Kothari (the officer incharge of the royal grainries) when asked about the position of stocks, fearing the loss of his influence, (by telling the truth) falsely replied that the stores were sufficient for a considerable time. But scarcely had the officer retired, when it became generally known that there was no more corn in the state grainary. Ibid.
 2. Khusrau, K.E., p. 53; Isami, F.S., p. 273; Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verses 170 ff; Vidyapati, Purusa Pariksa, text, p. 55 (cited in Hammirayan, Appdx. iii). The females of the family were headed by Ranga Devi. See Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, vers 173.
 3. They included Virma (brother of Hammira), Mahimasahi (Muhammad Shah), Jaja, Gangadhar Tilak and Kshetra Singh Paramara. Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verses 190-205.
 4. Barani, T.F.S., p. 283; Isami, F.S., p. 273 and Ferishta, text, p. 108. Ferishta adds that 'the Mongol chief who lay wounded in the battle-field, was told by Sultan Alaud-Din in an insulting tone, 'What gratitude would he evince if he (Sultan) should command his wounds to be immediately cured'? The Mongol chief replied, 'I would put you to death and install Hammira's son on the throne'. Ibid., p..108.

The event occurred on 3rd Zikad, A.H. 700/10th July, 1301 A.D.¹ Ranthambhor and Chhain were assigned to Ulugh Khan.² With this ended the line of Ranthambhor Chauhans, who had with varying success maintained their entity during the entire thirteenth century.

Conquest of Chittor:

About two years after the fall of Ranthambhor, Sultan decided to subjugate Chittor which had probably become prominent during the course of the thirteenth century. Although there had been a number of invasions³ during the period of early Turkish Sultans, it seems the fort had not been permanently reduced to submission.

In 1299 a large Khalji army passed close to Mewar. Since its main objective was the conquest of Gujarat, the Commanders, Ulugh Khan and Nusrat Khan do not seem to have

-
1. Khusrau, K.E., p. 64; Suri, H.M.K., Canto 13, verse 187; Nainsi, H.K., Vol. III, p. 184. The date of the fall of Ranthambhor given by Suri is 12th July, 1301 A.D., i.e. two days later than Khusrau's date. It is said that Jaja who had been left behind in fort continued the struggle for two more days before the final fall of the fort. A memorial tablet at Gadhala (Shivpuri) also mentions that Hammira was slain in 1301 A.D. A.S.I., 1916-17, p. 20.
 2. Barani, T.E.S., p. 283; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 77. Chhain was renamed 'Shahr-i-Nau'. A number of temples including that of Bahar Dev were raised to ground. Khusrau, K.E., p. 69.
 3. See Supra, pp. 104-107, 123-124, 131-132.

made any deliberate attempt either to encounter the Mewar chief or to subjugate his principality.

The Kanhadadeprabandha, a mid-fifteenth century Gujarati chronicle, states that after crossing river Banas, the only place captured by Muslim forces was the fortress of Modosa.¹ Although Jaina chronicle Tirthakalpa,² as well as a later inscription³ distinctly state that Samar Simha, the ruling Guhila chief rescued Chittor by defeating Sultan Alaud-Din, it seems that the Muslim army avoided a possible encounter and pushed on towards Gujarat. Probably the Muslim commanders agreed to the payment of tribute⁴ and left Mewar unmolested.

The major onslaught against Mewar, however, came in 1303, when the territory of Mewar was thoroughly sacked and subjugated for the first time by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.

1. The fort of Modosa (written as Radosa in K.S.Lal, History of the Khaljis, p. 69) is situated close to Ranthambhor on river Banas. See also Padmabh, K.P., Canto I, verses 49-51. For further details see Supra chapter on 'Conquest of Jalor', pp. 186-197.
2. See Supra, pp. 131-32.
3. The Ranakpur temple (Jodhpur) inscription dated V.S. 1496/1440 A.D., mentions Bhuvan Simha, a contemporary of Samar Simha as having defeated Sultan Alaud-Din. The Guhila chief, it appears blocked the way of the invading army and Ulugh Khan on his part carefully protected his flanks. Noticed in G.H.Ojha, A.R.R.M., 1920-21, p. 4; For text, see Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 409-10 and P.C.Nahar, J.L.S., Vol. I, pp. 165-66.
4. Infra, p. 160, fn. 2.

"... अने महाराज के राजे अने राजा अने राजा अने राजा ॥"

According to Amir Khusrau Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji started with his forces on Monday the 8th Jamadi-us Sani A.H. 702/28th January, 1303 A.D.¹ Khusrau as well as all other Muslim chroniclers are silent about the route followed by the royal troops.²

On reaching the fortress of Chittor, the imperial pavilion was pitched up between two rivers - Gambhiri and Berach. The Sultan directed the two wings of his army to besiege the fortress from both the sides.³ Two months of regular operations, however, did not yield any result.⁴

The failure of a direct attack perhaps led the Sultan to revise his policy and he started regular siege operations.

1. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 65, tr., Habib, p. 47; Hadivala, Studies in Indo Muslim History, p. 250.

2. For a discussion of the possible route, see M.L. Mathur, I.H.Q., 1951, p. 56, fn. 12. The route via Bharatpur, Bayana, Ranthambhor, and Bundi etc., was shortest. Again the territory up to Ranthambhor had earlier been annexed by Alaud-Din himself. This perhaps brought the imperial forces right up to the fortress of Chittor uninterruptedly. However, it is also possible that the Muslim forces marched via Ajmer which had already been in Muslim possession since the close of the 12th century.

3. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 65.

4. "دوامہ جنگی سہلاب تیغ تا مکر کرد میر سید بالہ ترے رفت"

Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 65. It is obvious that the first plan of the Sultan was to wrest the fortress by direct attack and this policy continued for two months till April, 1303.

In the course of these operations, catapults were raised to throw missiles and stones inside the fortress. This probably continued until August 26, 1303, when the fortress was finally stormed. It seems that the first attack was a failure not only because of the impregnability of the fortress¹ but also due to the stout resistance offered by the garrison.

Meanwhile the Sultan personally supervised the affairs from the fortress of 'Chittori',² where he held his meetings under the royal canopy. Strongmen were ordered to draw Maghribis, since nothing other than Maghribi could measure their strength.³

After a prolonged siege of about seven months, the strong fort of Chittor fell to the invading forces on Muharram A.H. 703/25th August, 1303 A.D.⁴ The Rai of

1. "عجب قلعه که سنگ زاده سر کوب آن ممکن نترسد۔"

Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 65.

2. Read as 'Chatarvari' (چترداری) in Khazain-ul-Futuh, (text, p. 66). A huge pile of earth was raised on the hillock, during the whole of the long and hot season of mid summer which ultimately reached to the level of the ramparts of the fortress. "This sand is still pointed out to the visitors of the place at the southern end by the name of more Magari." See M.L.Mathur, I.H.Q., 1951, p. 57.

3. Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 6, tr., 50.

4. Ibid., text, p. 68.

Chittor¹ begged for his safety and came to Sultan's presence. His life was spared, but soldiers numbering about 30,000 were put to the sword,² and the adjoining territory was thoroughly sacked. The place was renamed Khizrabad and Khizr Khan was crowned with a red canopy, robe of honour and two banners and given over the charge of the conquered territories, while the Sultan himself returned to his capital.³ The account of the fall of Chittor, as given by Amir Khusrau, although correct and accurate, fails to furnish some important aspects of the above campaign. Some of the important points like the name of the ruling chief and his ultimate fate etc., have altogether been omitted by Khusrau in his account. In order to fill these blanks one must turn to other sources.

From inscriptions we find that Samar Simha and Natan Simha were the rulers of Mewar contemporaneous with Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji. About eight inscriptions⁴ belonging to

1. Khusrau without giving the name of the ruling prince of Mewar, states that the Rana of Chittor was the most exalted of all the Hindu rulers and that all the kings of Hindustan acknowledged his superiority. Deval Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 67.
2. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 68.
3. Ibid., text, p. 68 and Deval Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 67. The account of Amir Khusrau is corroborated by all other Persian writers with little variations. See also Barani, T.E.S., text, p. 299, and Isami, E.S., text, pp. 280-81.
4. E.I., Vol. XXII, p. 285; I.A., Vol. XXII, p. 80; Bhandarkar's, List, Nos., 593, 610, 617, 388; A.R.I.E., No. 490.

Samar Simha's period indicate that the chief enjoyed a long reign of at least twenty six years. Regarding Samar Simha's activities, the Abu inscription dated V.S. 1342/1285 A.D., boastfully records Samar Simha as acting like a Primeval Boar, who lifted the land of Gurajaras out of the Turushka sea.¹

The Hammiramahakavya mentions the devastation of Medapata (Mewar) during the course of Hammira's digvijay. Since Hammira's war-like operations were conducted before the fall of Ranthambhor (1301) at any rate, the event must have occurred during Samar Simha's reign. According to Chauhan chronicles, Samar Simha protected Mewar by giving danda,² during Ulugh Khan's expedition to Gujarat in 1299.³ This possibly indicates that the chief paid tribute and

1. Abu inscription, verse 46,
I.A., Vol. XVI, p. 350.

2. Suri, Vividhatirthakalpa, p. 95.

3. Suri, the contemporary chronicler of Guhila Samar Simha, mentions about the victory of Ulugh Khan over Gujarat in V.S. 1356/1299 A.D. at the instigation of Madhava - the minister of Karna Baghela of Gujarat and further that Samar Simha rescued Chittor by paying tribute. Ulugh Khan's wrath therefore, fell on the towns like Bagad and Modosa etc. Although Persian chroniclers, notably Khusrau and Barani agree with Suri's date as well as the Gujarat invasion, they are silent about any Muslim scuffle with the Guhila chief Samar Simha. See Suri, Vividhatirthakalpa, p. 95; Khusrau, K.F., p. 50; Barani, T.F.S., p. 251 and Isami, F.S., pp. 252-54.

escaped molestation.¹ The peace purchased was, however, very short.

It appears from the available epigraphic evidence that Samar Simha's rule extended up to V.S. 1358/1301 A.D.² But an inscription incised barely four days before Sultan Alaud-Din's march towards Chittor and dated V.S. 1359/1302 A.D.³, records Ratan Simha as the ruling chief of Chittor. It is therefore, likely that Ratan Simha came to the throne shortly before the Khalji expedition against Chittor. This may explain Isami's writing the name of the chief as Sonar Si⁴ (Samar Simha) instead of Ratan Simha.

The name of Ratna Simha who occupied the throne of Mewar shortly before the attack of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, is also known from various other epigraphic and literary sources, notably the Kumbhalgadh inscription of V.S. 1517/1460 A.D.⁵

1. H.C. Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 1195. It has been pointed out by G.H. Ojha (U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 172-73) that Samar Simha protected Mewar by inflicting a defeat on Ulugh Khan. This seems to be wrong since the word Danda may also mean tribute and not 'punishment'.

2. Chittor inscription of the above date (now in Udaipur Museum). G.H. Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 176, fn. 1.

3. Dariba inscription of Ratan Simha of the above date.

"संवत् 1359 वर्षे माघ शुद्ध ५ तृतीयादि तारिखे श्री गंगराज सिंहा
देवालय २१ तारिखे महामहेश्वर महाराजाधिराज श्री गंगराज सिंह देवदत्त, विजय रक्षितः"

G.H. Ojha, Ibid., pp. 495-96.

4. Isami, F.S., p. 281. "در و سونر سینه گریں بود را"

5. "म (समर सिंह) राज सिंह राजा विजय रक्षितः २१ तारिखे..."

Chhitai Charita,¹ (c. V.S. 1583/1526 A.D.) and Padmavat² (c. V.S. 1597/1540 A.D.).

Ratan Simha of the Kumbhalgad inscription seems to have been the prince during whose time Sultan Alaud-Din reduced Chittor. Although there is nothing in the epigraphic evidence to indicate that the prince fought against Sultan Alaud-Din, his rule over Chittor is conclusively proved by the Dariba inscription of Magh Sudi 5, 1389/1302 A.D., already mentioned which designates him 'Medapatamandale Maharajakula Sri Ratna Simha kalyan vijay rajye ...'³.

The Ratan son of Jayasi's Padmavat, who is written as the son of Chitra Sen,⁴ too is surely to be identified with the Ratna Simha of the Dariba inscription. Jayasi mentions Ratna Simha was ruling over Chittor when Sultan Alaud-Din invaded his territory.⁵ Jayasi has, however, manifestly given him wrong parentage.

A discrepant note is introduced by certain bardic accounts, which give the name of the ruler of Mewar in the time of Alaud-Din Khalji as Lakshman Simha, and allege that he was attacked by Alaud-Din because he had given shelter to Ratna Simha, son of Hammira of Ranthambhor.⁶

1. Dashratha Sharma, P.I.H.C., 1961.

2. Jayasi, Padmavat, ed. by V.S. Aggarwala, p/ 3/-34.

3. See Dariba inscription, Supra, p. 161, fn. 3.

4. Jayasi, Padmavat, p.

5. Ibid.

6. Surajamal, Vamsabhashkar, Vol. II, p. 1686, cited in K.R. Qanungo, Studies in Rajput History, p. 12.

It may be mentioned that the bardic accounts as preserved in Hammira-Raso² and Vamsabhasakar (both nineteenth century compositions), can not be accepted as true due to their lateness. The Chittor inscription of V.S. 1358/1301 A.D.⁴ mentions Samar Simha's rule over Mewar in that year. No ruler, such as Lakshman Simha, could possibly have therefore, reigned between Samar Simha's time and Ratna Simha, who is designated ruler of Mewar the very next year by the Dariba inscription which itself was set up just on the eve of the Khalji expedition. It seems certain that the late bardic accounts have made Lakshmana Simha who was a Sesodia feudatory of Ratna Simha, and progenitor of the later Sesodia dynasty of Mewar into the actual ruler of Mewar, and confused Ratna Simha, the Mewar ruler, with another Ratna Simha, a prince of Ranthambhor.⁵

1. Qanungo is quite wrong in confusing all this along with the Ratna Simha of the Chirwa inscription (See Supra under account of Balban's raid) with the Mewar ruler who actually faced Alaud-Din Khalji as the chief who fought against Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji. For a further discussion on the subject See J.P.Singh, 'Ratna, the son of Chauhana Hammira and the sack of Chittor', J.R.A.S. of G.K. and Ireland, 1964, p. 95 ff.
2. Jodharaja, Hammira-Raso, (N.P.S., Benaras, 1929) pp. 24-25.
3. Vamsabhasakar (cited in K.R.Qanungo, op.cit., p. 13).
4. G.H.Ojha, H.R.I., Vol. I, p. 176 fn. 1.

Nainsi in his Khyat, while referring to the fall of Chittor, states that Ratna Simha, son of Ajay Simha and brother of Lakshman Simha died along with Lakshman Simha in the affair of Padmani.¹ This, however, does not seem to be correct. Ratna Simha was not the son of Ajai Simha but Jai Simha and Lakshman Simha was not the brother but only a Samanta of Guhila house of Mewar.

That Ratna Simha of younger branch was the son of Jai Simha is known from Rajprasastimahakavya, inscribed on slabs at the famous Rajasmand lake, about 66 k.ms. east of Udaipur. The lake was built by Rana Raj Singh between 1662-1676 A.D. On its embarkment are inscribed famous Sanskrit verses giving the geneology of the younger i.e. Sesodia branch of Mewar rulers. It is known from the above Mahakavya that Jai Simha had two sons namely Lakshman Simha and Ratna Simha.² This is also confirmed from Amar Kavya³ of Ranchod Bhat, composed during the period of Rana Amar Singh (1597-1620 A.D.).

It may thus be stated that it was Ratna Simha son of Samar Simha Guhila of Kumbhalgadh inscription,⁴ the Padmavat⁵

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 14.

2. "... नरैः पुत्रैः नृपैः पितृभ्यः प्रसूतैः ॥ नरैः पितृभ्यः प्रसूतैः ॥
 राजप्रसास्ति, Canto 3, verses 3-4.

3. Cited in Hemratan's, Gora Badal Padmani Chaupai, int., p. 78.

4. For Kumbhalgadh inscription, see G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 180, fn. 2.

5. Padmavat, p.

and Nainsi Khyat,¹ who was ruling at Chittor and fought against Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji in 1303 A.D.

Amir Khusrāu dealing with the events immediately after the fall of Chittor fort states that '... The Solomon of the age ... went into the fort ... The Rai struck with the lightning of the emperor's wrath ... sprang out of the stone gate ... flew towards the imperial pavilion, thus protecting him from the lightning of the sword ...'.² The same authority further states that 'The Rai sought refuge in the red canopy from fear of green swords, the great emperor when he saw the vegetarian Rai trembling with fear ... though the Rai was a rebel, yet the breeze of royal mercy did not allow any hot wind to blow upon him.'³

The appearance of the prince at the summit of the hill may refer to temporary cessation of hostilities, since the chronicler informs us that when Rai sought refuge with the Sultan, his life was spared.

However, nothing is known about any such negotiations

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 14.

2. Khusrāu, K.E., text, p. 47.

3. Ibid., text, p. 68

۱) اگرچہ باغی بود۔ نسیم افروز بادشاہانہ نڈاشت

or what was the ultimate fate of the Rai.¹ Our chronicler simply states that Rai's life was 'spared' whereas all other rebels numbering 30,000 were put to sword.²

Whether prince Ratna Simha 'surrendered' or was put to death by the invading forces, it appears that the hostilities were resumed some time after the fall of Chittor

1. There is a vague reference in a later inscription of V.S., 1517/1460 A.D., mentioning the surrender of the prince as an act of cowardice.

"अमोघं त्वं वायुना वै विमुक्तम् न जाते 'वै' पुर-वत्पञ्चमे ॥"

(Kumbhalgadh Prasasti, verse 177). The inscription reads "That ruler (Samar Simha) with all his sins removed by the worship of Mahesa became the lord of Svarga, after entrusting the defence of Mount Chitrakuta to his son Ratna Simha. When he had departed, Lakshman Simha of the family of Kumbha defended that excellent fort Having thus destroyed his enemies in battle, he (Lakshman Simha) died purified by weapons while defending Chitrakuta". Ibid., verses 176-178.

2.

۱۰۰ قبرسوں نے باغیانہ دیگر و زمینہ مقداری ہزار کندہ دوزخ مرگ گئے تھے دویم کردند

Khusrau, K.F., p. 68.

3. There is a reference to the event in Kakka Suri's Nabhinandan Jinodhara Grantha, a near contemporary Jain chronicle (c. 1336 A.D.) wherein it is mentioned that Sultan Alaud-Din took the ruler of Chitrakuta for captive and having deprived him of all his wealth, made him like a monkey to move from one place to another. P.I.H.C. 1954, p. 241. Mahār Jātāl in his Gora Badāl Chaupai (c. V.S. 1680/1613 A.D.) speaks about imprisonment and ill-treatment of Ratna Simha (cited in Padmani Charitra Chaupai, pp. 13-14 and 23.

by the chiefs of younger branch i.e. Sesodia house.¹

The struggle was continued under the leadership of Lakshman Simha after Ratna Simha's death or surrender. It is evident from the subsequent events that Hammira who belonged to Sesodia line succeeded in recapturing the principality and his descendants continued to hold the territory for a long period. The succession of younger branch to the house of Mewar was effected because presumably no descendant of the elder branch after Ratna Simha survived, or cared to lead the resistance.

The Padmani affair:

The story of Alaud-Din Khalji's conquest of Chittor would be incomplete without a reference to the queen Padmini, who has been associated with the events leading to the sack

1. The geneology of the Sesodia branch is contained in Rajprasasti Mahakavya. Regarding the continuation of hostilities, the inscription records:

"नक्षत्रेण समीपवर्त्ये २६ एतं पञ्चमं १
लक्ष्मणसिंहादौ ५००० - त्वयोरुक्तं सत्यं सुतः ॥"

i.e. Lakshman Simha died along with his 12 brothers and seven sons during Alaud-Din's invasion of Chittor. Again the Kumbhalgadh Prasasti of V.S. 1517/1460 A.D. reads:

"इत्यं सत्यं किं रचितं सुतं यदेतत्
शत्रुसैन्ये लक्ष्मणसिंहादौ ५००० भ्रातृपुत्रैश्च युद्धे ॥"

Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 411. See also Nainsi which also corroborates the above prasastis.

"रत्नसिंहादौ ५००० (अथ रत्नसिंहादौ) ५००० भ्रातृपुत्रैश्च युद्धे ॥
गोविन्दसिंहस्य ५००० भ्रातृपुत्रैश्च युद्धे ॥"

Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 14.

of Chittor fortress in 1303. The traditional story given in the 'Padmavat' of Malik Muhammad Jaysi and followed by many Muslim as well as Rajput (bardic) chronicles goes as under:-

Padmini, according to Jaysi's Padmavat, was the daughter of Ghandharva Sen of Simhaladvipa and Ratna Sen was the ruler of Chittor. When Ratna Sen heard through 'Hiraman' parrot about the extraordinary beauty of Padmini, he visited Simhaladvipa, in disguise of a Yogi and succeeded in marrying her. During this period one of the Brahmins, named Raghvachetan, (an expert in the art of hypnotism), being expelled from the court of Chittor, went over to the court of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji at Delhi. He induced the Sultan to invade Chittor and bring beautiful Padmini to his harem.

The Sultan accordingly laid siege to the fortress of Chittor. When he did not succeed in his efforts even after a prolonged siege, he took recourse to treachery. He visited the fortress as a guest of the Rajputs and there he saw Padmini, the queen of his host in a mirror. When Ratna Sen went to see the Sultan off up to the outer gate, he was treacherously imprisoned and taken to Delhi.

Queen Padmini, after the imprisonment of her husband, with the advice of Gora and Badal, went to Delhi with 1600 Rajputs in Dolis and succeeded in obtaining the release of

her husband. Badal accompanied Padmini and Ratna Sen, while Gora resisted the persuading royal troops and fell fighting. After sometime prince Ratna Sen attacked Kumbhalmer and being wounded died sometime later. Padmini and Nagamati along with other women became sati. Alaud-Din at this time, made a second attack on Chittor and this time he met with complete success. Badal and the other Rajputs died fighting and Chittor was annexed to the Khalji empire.¹

The above story, with little variations, is also followed by many other later Rajput and Muslim chronicles.

-
1. Abul Fazl, A.A., tr., Vol. II, pp. 169-70. Ferishta, (T.F., text, p. 115) mistakenly writes Padmavati as the daughter of Ratna Sen. Jatmal Nahar, Padmavati Charitra Chaupai, ed. Sadul Rajasthani Research Institute (Bikaner), pp. 1-108. Apart from this many bardic tales about the Chauhan heroes Gora and Badal, have come to light. Some of the well-known works relating to the event are:

- A. Gora Badal Kavita. For text, see Padmavati, Charitra Chaupai, pp. 109-28.
- B. Hemratna's Gora Badal Charitra, written V.S. 1645. Text published by Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute (Jodhpur), pp. 1-60.
- C. Jatmal Nahar, Gora Badal Chaupai, (written V.S. 1680). For text see Padmavati Charitra Chaupai, (Bikaner), pp. 182-204.
- D. Labdhoday's, Padmini Charitra Chaupai. For reference to Gora Badal, See Ibid., pp. 66-108.
- E. Daulat Vijay's Khoman Ras. For extracts of Canto six referring to Gora Bada, see ibid., pp. 129-81.

The main particulars that Ratna Sen the ruling chief of Mewar, married Padmini, Alaud-Din's attack of Guhila capital to obtain possession of the fair Padmini, long and tough resistance by the Rajputs, negotiations, Ratna Sen's treacherous captivity and release by Padmini with the help of Gora Badal, Sultan's fresh attack on Chittor, the desperate defence and ultimate fall of Chittor, occur in many later Persian works and in bardic literature.¹

It may be stated here that Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji's lust for power and territorial subjugation was one of the major factors responsible for his invasion and the sack of Chittor. However, Jayasi's *Padmavat*, some later Muslim chronicles and the Rajput bardic literature, would make us believe that sole object of the Sultan to invade Chittor was to obtain possession of the fair Padmini.²

To a strong and cruel ruler like Alaud-Din Khalji, who cherished the desire of the world conquest, the independent existence of Chittor, in the neighbourhood of Delhi, could hardly be tolerated.

1. See *Supra*, p. 169, fn. 1.

2. Jayasi, *Padmavat*, p. 34.
 Abul Fazi, *Ain-i-Akbari*, tr., Vol. II, pp. 269-70; *Padmini Charitra Chaupai*, p. 45;
Gaura Badal Kavit, p. 117; *Khomsa Raso*,
 p. 137; *Gora Badal Chaupai*, p. 193 and
 Hemratan's *Gora Badal Charitra*, p. 25.

Apart from this reason, the invasion of Chittor can also be accounted for by Alaud-Din's eagerness to play the game of war with the Guhilas, who stood in his way to the conquest of Deccan.¹ The Guhila chief had already exhibited his aggressive attitude only four years earlier (in 1299) at the time of the invasion of Gujarat by Sultan Alaud-Din's forces.² That the Sultan's sole objective was to subjugate Chittor may be seen from a reference by Barani, when the chronicler states that the Kotwal of Delhi, advised him (i.e. the Sultan in 1297) to conquer places like Ranthambhor, Chittor, Chanderi, Malwa, Dhar and Ujjain etc.³

As to whether there is a kernel of truth in the Padmini legend, whether, for example, such a queen existed and attracted the attention of Alaud-Din Khalji, little can be said with definiteness, although much has been written for either view.⁴ To see her as an implied Sheba when Amir Khusrau describes Alaud-Din as a Solomon is as far-fetched, as to urge that Jayasi's Alaud-Din is not the Khalji ruler, but the Sayyed king of the same name. For the moment the entire matter may be left an open question.

1. I.H.Q., Vol. XXVII, p. 64.

2. Supra, pp. 155-56.

3. Barani, T.E.S., text, p. 269.

4. See separate table, infra, pp. 172-173.

TABLEMODERN WRITERS ON THE
PADIMINI AFFAIR

G.H.Ojha	<u>Udaipur Rajya ka Itihas (Hindi),</u> <u>Vol. II, pp. 491-95.</u>
R.R.Haldar	<u>Indian Antiquary, 1929-30,</u> <u>pp. 235-37.</u>
K.R.Qanungo	<u>Studies in Rajput History,</u> <u>pp. 1-20.</u>
K.S.Lal	<u>History of the Khaljis, pp. 120-30;</u> <u>The Annual Bulletin of the Nagpur</u> <u>University Historical Society,</u> <u>No. 1, October 1946.</u>
A.L.Srivastava	<u>The Sultanate of Delhi,</u> <u>pp. 236-38.</u>
S.C.Dutta	<u>'First Saka of Chittor', Indian</u> <u>Historical Quarterly, Vol. VII,</u> <u>June, 1931, pp. 287-300.</u>
M.L.Mathur	<u>'Chittor and Alaud-Din Khalji',</u> <u>I.H.Q., 1951, pp. 52-70.</u>
Ishwari Prasad	<u>History of Medieval India,</u> <u>pp. 196-98.</u>
Dashratha Sharma	<u>'Was Padimini a mere figment of</u> <u>Jayasi's imagination?' <u>Proceedings</u></u> <u>of Indian History Congress, 1961,</u> <u>pp- 176-77 and Introduction to</u> <u>Padimini Charita Chaupai;</u> <u>Chittai Charita.</u>
A.B.L.Awasthi	<u>'Padimini episode re-examined',</u> <u>Proceedings of Indian History</u> <u>Congress, 1963, pp. 149-51.</u>

- J.P.Singh 'Ratna Sinha, the son of Chauhan Hammira and the sack of Chittor', Royal Asiatic Society of U.K. and Ireland, 1964, part iii & iv, pp. 98-103.
- S.Ray Delhi Sultanate, Edited, R.C. Majumdar, Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, Vol. VI, pp. 26-27.
- M.Habib Khazain-ul-Futuh, tr., p. 48, fn. 2.
- A.C.Banerjee 'Life and Times of Alaud-Din', Proceedings of Indian History Congress, Vol. III, pp. 799-812.
- Shyamal Dass Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, p. 284.
- James Tod Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Vol. I, pp. 308-11.
- Muni Jinvi Jay Gora Badal Charitra, of Kavi Hemratna, ed. Muni Jinvi Jay, (Jodhpur, 1968), p. 80.
- K.K.Basu Khalji Imperialism, Appdx., pp. 142-43.
- Wahid Mirza Letter to Professor Qanungo, dated 18.1.1956, cited in K.R. Qanungo, Studies in Rajput History, p. 6, fn. 1.

Later History of Chittor:

As we have seen, Amir Khusrau records that after its capture Chittor was renamed Khizrabad after the name of prince Khizr Khan, who was crowned with a red canopy, a robe of honour and two banners and was given over the charge of the conquered territories.¹

The exact period of prince Khizr Khan's administration and the subsequent history of Chittor, till its recapture by Sesodia Rana Hammira, is obscure. It seems that Khizr Khan's possession of Chittor lasted for more than a decade, although the prince is not stated to have remained in person at Chittor during most of this period. The recall of prince in A.H. 704/1303-04 A.D. as stated by Ferishta,² however, is not correct.

An inscription found from a tomb, outside Chittor and dated 10th Zil-Hijjah, A.H. 709/11th May 1310 A.D.,³ eulogises prince's father Sultan Alaud-Din, which suggests Khalji hold of the territory. Again Ferishta refutes his own statement at another place while describing the events of the year A.H. 711/1311-12 A.D. He states, Malik Kafur had

1. Khusrau, K.F., p. 68, tr. p. 49; Ibid., Deval Rani Khizr Khan, p. 67; Ferishta, T.F., p. 111.

2. Ibid., p. 115.

3. G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. II, p. 497.

intended to visit Chittor to meet the prince (Khizr Khan) while on his way to Deccan in A.H. 711.¹

Khalji Inscription at Chittor:

The Persian inscription dated 10th Zil Hijjah, A.H. 709, cited above, is found from the tomb of 'Ghaibi Pir', situated at a distance of about a mile outside the Delhi gate of the town. The record being fragmentary, it not possible to give its purport. The extant portion of the text, comprising four verses in Persian, merely contains the eulogy of the king and the date. It is however, not unlikely that this record originally formed part of the epigraph referring to the construction of Jami mosque of Chittor by Sultan Alaud-Din.² The other inscription which is also fragmentary, appears to have related to the construction of a congregational mosque in Chittor, as it records of the erection of a Jami mosque to which it must have originally belonged. It is also interesting to note that the said mosque was constructed at the site of a temple which was then lying in ruins.³ This is important

1. Ferishta, T.F., p. 115.

2. For text and translation of the inscription, see Z.A.Desai 'Inscriptions of Alaud-Din Khalji from Chittorgarh', E.I.A.S., 1959-60, p. 72.

3. "مسجد جامع را بنا کرد
بیت نموده را بود خراب قتاده"

Ibid., p. 73. The other inscription, whose find spot is not known, is now kept in 'Top Khana' building inside the fort and reads "سکندر تائی ابوالخضر محمد شاه" Ibid, p.73.

showing that, not always as is generally supposed, the Hindu buildings were pulled down to provide material for mosques. Dr. Desai on the basis of similarities in metre, size and type of both the inscriptions, infers that Sultan Alaud-Din had ordered the construction in Chittor of a congregational mosque, built on the above date, although no trace remains of any old mosque in Chittor now.¹

Bardic accounts relate an interesting but unhistorical story of prince Khizr Khan's recall from Chittor and the bestowal of his territories upon Sonigara Chauhan Maladeva. It is stated in Nainsi's Khyat² that after the death of Chauhan Kanhada Deva of Jalor (1311 A.D.), his brother Maladeva became outlaws and started plundering the territories of Chittor now in possession of the Khaljis. The same bard further mentions that the Sultan being embarrassed, reconciled Maladeva by enlisting him as his vassal and bestowing upon him the kingdom of Chittor. Maladeva held Chittor for seven years and died in Chittor itself.³

1. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1959-60, p. 72.

2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, pp. 204-05.

3. Ibid.

"मालदेव गुह्याल सावेन लीरि बडे, जकरा हे। जालार रे रावल
 ११७५६ बीज राखण वाहेन बीरिया, पदे पाल साहु रावल ११७५६
 बीरिया मोरन गेह पीया। मालदेव छपे, पण्डित पीया। पदे साहे गेह पीया, मालदेवु दिपा।"

Ferishta too states that the Sultan ordered Prince Khizr Khan to evacuate it and make it over to the nephew of the raja.(?) The Hindu prince in a short time restored the principality to its former condition and retained the tract of Chittor as tributary to Sultan Alaud-Din during the rest of his reign. T.F., p. 115.

The whole story however, forfeits credence with the actual discovery of Persian inscription of Sultan Ghiyas-ud-Din Tughluq's period¹, as well as another inscription found in the tomb of 'Ghaibi Pir' Mosque at Chittor and dated 9th Shawwal, A.H. 725/18th September, 1325 A.D. The latter inscription mentions Malik Asadud-Din Arslan, cousin of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq, who was appointed Naib-Barbak by Sultan Ghiyasud-Din in A.H. 720/1320 A.D. Malik Asadud-Din held Chittor in the capacity of a governor under his uncle and perhaps continued in the post at least up to the accession of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq.

1. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 67-68. Alaud-Din, having found it impossible to hold out Chittor against the gallant Rajputs ordered his son Khizr Khan to vacate it - after about 10 years, (according to R.R.Haldar, I.A., Vol. LX, pp. 235-37) or between the years 1314-15 A.D. (according to Lal, History of the Khaljis, pp. 120-30) and hand it over to Maldeva Sonigara. The account of what happened afterwards as given by these authors is again a matter of conjecture rather than of facts based on unimpeachable sources. According to this account, Chittor remained under direct or indirect control of the Sultans of Delhi till about 1325 A.D. after which it was conquered by Rana Hammira Sisodia, while Lal asserts that after the death of Maldeva in about 1321 A.D., Hammira became master of whole of Mewar and assumed the title of Maharana. These writers, Dr Desai states, have unfortunately overlooked a few pieces of evidence in course of their study. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, p. 69.

The above two inscriptions prove the direct control of the Sultans of Delhi over Chittor and refute the story of prince Khizr Khan's replacement by Maladeva Chauhan.¹

Khalji Invasion of Jaisalmer:

The Bhati principality of Jaisalmer, as already mentioned,² practically remained independent of Muslim influence during the thirteenth century. However, epigraphic evidence coupled with the bardic accounts, suggest a Khalji invasion of Jaisalmer sometime during the first decade of the fourteenth century.

According to traditional accounts preserved in the Nainsi Khyat, Mularaja and Ratna Simha, both sons of Rawal Jaitsi, picked up a quarrel with the Sultan of Delhi by killing one 'Pirsada' along with his retinue, while he was halting at Jaisalmer on his return journey from Rum (Byzantium).³

The same bard further informs us that the Sultan enraged at this, despatched his general 'Kamaldi' (Kamalud-Din Gurg) with 7,000 horsemen. The Khalji commander besieged

-
1. Ibid., Z.A.Desai holds that Chauhan occupation of Chittor is a fanciful story and that Asadud-Din probably took over the charge of Chittor from a governor of pre-Tughluq period otherwise one would have to postulate a fresh conquest of Mewar.
 2. For the early history of Jaisalmer, see Supra, pp.48-53.
 3. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, text, p. 46, tr. R.N.Dugad, (N.P.S., Benaras), p. 290 .

the fort of Jaisalmer but failed to reduce the fort even after 2 or 3 years of siege. The Sultan, thereupon, despatched 'Kapur' (Malik Kafur). The second attempt too met with no success and Malik Kafur is 'said to have lost the battle and fled losing his 70,000 men in the battle-field. This obliged the Sultan to send Makalud-Din for a second time with a force of 80,000 horsemen. The commander invested the fort and is said to have reduced it to submission after a long siege of twelve years.¹

Nainsi's version although highly imaginative, seems to be basically correct. There is no doubt that the bardic account is exaggerated and far-fetched but a number of Sanskrit inscriptions found from Jaisalmer itself indirectly refer to the capitulation of Jaisalmer fort by the Muslims which was later freed by the Bhati chiefs.

The earliest of these inscriptions dated V.S. 1417/ 1360 A.D., found from Sambhava Jaina temple, Jaisalmer, suggests that a conflict took place between Jaisalmer chief and the Muslims.²

A Sanskrit prasasti from Jaisalmer dated V.S. 1473/ 1416 A.D. mentions the recapture of Jaisalmer fort from the Mlechchhas by Ghata Simha. The text of the inscription

1. Nainsi, N.K., text, pp. 46-51; tr., pp. 291-96.
2. C.M.I.B., Vol. XXI, Appdx., I, p. 62.
3. Ibid., p. 63, verse 7.

surely suggests that Jaisalmer had been in possession of the Sultans of Delhi before Ghata Simha's reign. The chief is recorded in the inscription as having 'wrested Vapra (fort) from the Mlechchhas'.¹

To determine the name of the Sultan of Delhi, during whose reign the invasion to Jaisalmer was led, it is necessary to look at the geneology of the Bhati chiefs of Jaisalmer.²

Since Ghata Simha is known to have died in 1361 A.D.,³ the earlier loss of Jaisalmer, must have occurred much earlier, and the ascription of it to Alaud-Din's reign would seem reasonable.

About four Sanskrit inscriptions of Bhatika Samvat 685/1308 A.D., further lead us to assign the year of the inscriptions as the period of the commencement of the siege of Jaisalmer. One of these inscriptions mentions a number of chiefs who are said to have fallen fighting in defence of cows and their women and that the Kharaparas (Muslims)

1. C.M.J.B., p. 63, verse 7.

... "धृष्टिं विनाशयति: धृष्टिं कृत्वा अमरं जगत् प्रदाय अन्तर्द्वारं ६, ५५२) नरिगण्यः"

i.e. "... Ghata Simha captured the fort (of Jaisalmer) by destroying like a lion the elephants called Mlechchhas."

2. For geneology of the Bhati chiefs of Jaisalmer, see C.M.J.B., Appdx. I; Bhandarkar's, List, Nos. 738, 772, 777, 787.

3. I.H.Q., Vol. XXXV, p. 229.

succeeded in capturing horses and some other things.¹ It therefore, seems possible that the siege was commenced in 1308² during Sultan Alaud-Din's period. The mention of the names of Kamalud-Din and Malik Kafur in the siege operations, may further lend support to underlying authenticity of the bardic account.

Siwana:

The only notable region in Rajasthan still unsubdued after the subjugation of Chittor and Ranthambhor was that of Marwar, containing two notable fortresses of Jalor and Siwana. These two places were held by the Sonigara Chauhan Kanhada Deva.

Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, sent his commander Kamal-ud-Din Gurg, in 13th Muharram A.H. 708/3rd July, 1308 A.D.³

-
1. I.H.Q., Vol. XXXV, p. 229, inscription No. 19.
 2. According to Nainsi, Jaitai who was ruling over Jaisalmer at the time of commencement of the hostilities, died soon after. (Nainsi N.K., Vol. II, p. 295). Mulraja the next successor too died after ruling for less than one and a half year and was succeeded by Ratna Simha. Mularaja according to the same chronicler, died fighting against the invaders. The total siege, therefore, must have lasted only for about a year and not 12 years as mentioned by the bard. Ibid., text, p. 51, tr., p. 296.
 3. Siwana is situated 25 - 38 north and 70 - 26 east. It lies at a distance of about 60 miles s.w. of Jodhpur city. (Rajputana Gazetteer, Vol. III, prt. A, p. 220). Siwana according to Amir Khusrau, lay at a distance of 500 parangs from Delhi Khusrau, K.F., p. 74. "چنانکہ مقدار پانچ سو فرسنگ از ..."

to invade the territory of Siwana.¹ The fortress of Siwana was held by Satal Deva, as a feudatory of the Sonigara Chauhans of Jalor.²

Satal Deva was a brave leader and effectively managed the command of the strong fortress of Siwana. Khusrau praises Satal Deva in laudatory terms. 'He was powerful like Aharman and all the Ravata bowed to his authority. In his fort of stone, which was stronger than iron, there were many gabrs, with hearts of steel.'³

1. Khusrau, K.F., p. 74; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 78. puts the event between A.H. 700 and 702/1300-1303 A.D. which is wrong.

2. Tradition relates the foundation of Siwana by Viranarayana s/o Bhoja Paramara in V.S. 1077/1019 A.D.

"सिवना १०७७ च्यास २ अहं बोरगारायण, पुराण, अहोरात्रि"

Nainsi, N.K., Vol. III, p. 28. At another place Viranarayana s/o Bhoja Paramara in V.S. Kirtipala, the founder of Jalor.

"सिवना १०७७ च्यास २ अहं बोरगारायण, पुराण, अहोरात्रि"

(Ibid., Vol. I, p. 187).

From Nainsi's statement it thus appears that the fort came into the possession of the Chauhans after about a century of its foundation by the Paramaras. During the time of Sultan Alaud-Din's invasion, Siwana was held by Kanhadadeva's nephew Satal Deva.

3. "داست آهري نام ستيل ديو - هميش راورت بوزمان هميش ميو -
شعب محبت باقيد جانگر - ولي شد بيت پيشايش غناي گر -
بے گبران آهري دل بگارش - زده پيش قلعہ سنگين متر حمارش -"

Khusrau, Deval Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 69.

According to traditional accounts, Satal Deva had already encountered the advancing Muslim forces near Mandor and had also pushed back the imperial forces when he was sent with a large Chauhan force by his over lord Kanhada Deva.¹ A long period of inaction (while Malik Kafur was away in the Deccan) perhaps made the Sultan restless and he marched himself to Sivana. However, it seems that invasion of Sivana, was a first step towards the annexation of the Chauhan kingdom of Jalor.²

The strong fortress which was 'so high that the eagle could not reach its summit in ten flights'³ was besieged. The Sultan ordered his right and left wings to attack the fortress from the southern and northern sides respectively.⁴ A pashib reaching the summit of the hill was constructed and the maghrabi stones were thrown from all the sides. All these operations were directed and supervised by Kamalud-Din Gurg.⁵

1. "सब लारव पासायल सराउ पावरल देवापे ।
समो/कोपे राउले दा-हस दे भापु केस दीपापे ॥
देवे दागे ३१२/३ सोलम व्यु ममा वउ लेय... मारउ मलम पाहल ।
Padmanabh, K.E., Vol. I, pp. 48-53.

2. For details of the conquest of Jalor, see Infra, pp. 186-197.

3. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 75, tr. Habib, p. 54.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., text, p. 76, tr., p. 54.

The siege, however, seems to have lasted for quite a long period. According to Amir Khusrau, the imperial forces had been attempting to annex the fortress for five or six years.¹ The resistance on the part of the besieged was quite tough and in the words of the same chronicler, the forces under Satal Deva 'did not flee even when their heads were cut into pieces.'²

It is said that Kanhada Deva despatched his forces to the rescue of the besiegers.³ These forces killed among others, Khalji commanders like Malik Nahar and Khadgadhar Bhoja.⁴

”شکرتشہ پنج و شش سال بکندہ نیم جنش را فرومال۔“

1. Khusrau, Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 69. Khusrau states that the fortress was captured after 2 months hard fighting (Khusrau K.E., p. 98). According to Isami, (E.S., text, p. 316) the siege lasted for 40 days.

”کہ اگرچہ پیرایا ایسوں از زخم شمشیر چون فرق گوزن۔ شاخ شاخ فتنہ پوری نئے کردند“

2. Khusrau K.E., text, p. 74; tr., Habib, p. 54; Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 78.
3. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto II, verse 49.

4. Of the two Muslim commanders mentioned above, the latter (गजाली बसिधर Padmanabh, K.P., Canto II, verse 73) has been identified as the natural brother of Hammira of Ranthambhor, who had taken shelter with Sultan Alaud-Din during the siege of Ranthambhor.

”तत्र पयनर-पयमात्रि स गोज-सोदय स्वगद-परमुरय।
रतोरसवयं युतादेयं च पदमा भवत नम अद-गोपयः ॥“

Ibid., Canto 10, verse 11). There is also a reference to one Mahakhadgadhar Bhojadeva in a Sanskrit inscription dated V.S. 1362/1305 A.D. during the victorious reign of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.

”...गदराजा/परमुरय श्रीगदलभवदीय पयमात्रय गदय(यय) सुपर-पय गजालदेव अयय ॥“

E.I., Vol. XXX, p. 190. It is possible that the Bhoja of this inscription is the same as that mentioned in K.P.

The traditional accounts as preserved in Kanhada-deprabandha, (a biography of Kanhada Deva written during the middle of the fifteenth century) refers to treachery, through which the Muslim forces succeeded in capturing the fort. It is related that the water of the fort reservoir was polluted with the help of one Bhaila Paramara,¹ who is said to have been promised the possession of fort after its capture.

Whatever the real reason, the garrison at last surrendered and the imperial forces entered the fortress. Satal Deva made an unsuccessful attempt to flee towards Jalor but was captured alive and put to death along with his other assistants.²

Khusrau puts the date of this event as Tuesday, 23rd Rabiul Awwal, 708 A.H./ 10th Nov., 1308 A.D.³ The fortress after its capture was given over to Kamalud-Din Gurg.⁴

1. "अधिकृत भेद देखाउती अरोचरु करीउ विजयस ।
एह पाणी नैव पीजीउ आमुंरा हव भास ॥"

Padmanabh, K.P., Vol. II, p. 95. The name of this Bhaila Chief is given as Sajjan by Nainsi. "राजा राजा, राजा राजा"
राव सोमर दादीनरा । पण, अमावदीनचु मिले जठ पण ॥ "

- Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 193.
2. Khusrau, K.E., text, pp. 77-78; Ibid., Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 69; Isami, F.S., text, p. 317; Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 78. Ferishta states that Satal Deva sent a golden effigy of himself and begged for mercy which was granted by the Sultan. This is wrong. All the contemporary and near-contemporary sources agree that Siwana chief was killed during the capture of the fort. See Khusrau, K.E., p. 78; Isami, F.S., p. 317; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 78.
3. Khusrau, K.E., text, p. 77.
4. Ibid., p. 78. Barani states that Siwana and other territories were entrusted to Walis and Muqtis. T.E.S., p. 323.

Jalor:

Alaud-Din Khalji's conquest of Jalor¹ has not been properly described in the accounts of the Muslim chroniclers, including Khusrav and Barani, while Isami does not even contain a brief reference to it. Fortunately for us, the gap is filled in by Rajput chroniclers, particularly Kanhadadeprabandha, (a work exclusively dealing with the rise and fall of Jalor chief Kanhada Deva, composed as early as V.S. 1512/1455 A.D.) and Virande Sonigara ki Bat, (a semi-historical work, by an unknown writer, completed sometime about V.S. 1761). The two works apart from a host of others, give a graphic account of Chauhan Kanhada Deva, and of his kingdom, which was the last prominent state in Rajasthan, to be subjugated by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.

Jalor was included among the Iqlims mentioned by Alaul Mulk, as reported by Barani, which due to its strategic importance and continued hostility with the centre, required immediate annexation by the Sultan.²

While giving a very brief reference to the kingdom of Jalor, Barani states that Jalor, including the other territories in Rajasthan after its conquest, was

1. For the early history of Jalor, see Supra, pp. 45-46, 99-103 and 112-115.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 269.

given over to the Walis and Muqtis.¹ Similarly Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi simply states that 'Kamalud-Din Gurg occupied Jalor and despatched 'Kamstra Deo' (Kanhada Deva) to hell.'²

The Chauhan accounts allege that the invasion of Jalor by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji was a result of the failure of negotiations for the marriage between Viram Deva the son of Kanhada Deva and an un-named daughter of the Sultan.³

1. Barani, T.E.S., text, p. 269.
2. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 78. The name of Kamalud-Din (Gurg?) is also mentioned by Kanhadadeprabandha, Padmanabh, K.E., Canto IV, p. 63.
3. According to Viramde Sonigara Ki Bat, (pp. 82-93) Panju, the teacher of Rao Viram, the son of Kanhada Deva, being angry with the former, went over to the side of Sultan Alaud-Din, where he showed skill in archery and pleased him. On being told that only Viram Deva excelled him, the Sultan invited Viram Deva to show his skill. In the exhibition contest, Panju was killed. Viram Deva's art attracted one of the daughters of the Sultan Alaud-Din. She desired to marry the Chauhan prince, and forced the Sultan to agree to this alliance. Viram Deva, however, taking an immense wealth from the Sultan on the plea of expenditure to be incurred towards the marriage, went back to his fortress and started preparations for the fortification and the defence of Jalor. The name of Alaud-Din's daughter according to another Chauhan chronicle 'Chauhan Kalpadrama (cited in Viramde Sonigara Ki Bat, Int., p. 19, fn. 4) was Sital (सिता). This is wrong, since Sital or Chhitai, according to Isami was the daughter of Raja Ramdeo, of, Deogir. (Isami, E.S., p. 352 "جستای پیاں دقت رام دیو") However, it is possible that some Hindu ladies of Sultan's harem, such as Chhitai or Kamla Devi (Khusrau, Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, pp. 81-82) may have desired to marry Viram Deva. For other ladies in the harem of the Sultan, see Viramde Sonigara Ki Bat, Int., pp. 19-20.

The contemporary of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji at the throne of Jalor was Kanhada Deva. The Chauhan prince had come to occupy an important position in the state administration as early as V.S. 1353/1298 A.D., during the rule of his father Samanta Simha.¹

Judging from the find spots of the inscriptions, it seems that the prince held all the territories which were ruled over by his father and grand-father. The prince handled the state administration so tactfully and effectively that he over-shadowed his father in ability and influence.²

By V.S. 1362/1306 A.D., which is the last known date of Samanta Simha's inscription, Kanhada Deva seems to have ruled over Jalor independently. His independent status, however, was soon challenged by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, who

1. "संवत् १३५३... सुवर्णागिरि, पिरौं अद्यै महाराजकुलस्य नाम्ने प्रह
दलपति, पञ्चपराज्य नय्याद पञ्चरोपजा विनि (रा) जयति दा-हसदेव
राज्य व्युत्त (अ) पुनः गान्... " "

E.I., Vol. XI, pp. 62-63. This also shows that Suvarnagiri or Kanchangiri, was the name of the hill of Jalor fort. Another inscription dated V.S. 1355/1298 A.D., found from Chotan (30 miles south west of Barmer) which designates Kanhada Deva as Youvaraja, or heir-apparent and was given share in state administration.

"संवत् १३५५... (अ) एह महाराजकुल सामन्त प्रिय देव
राजस्य दा-हसदेव राज्ये... " "

Ibid., p. 60, fn. 10; A.S.I., (H.C.), 1909, p. 54.

2. Although Samanta Simha ruled for over twenty years, nothing substantial regarding his long rule is known from the epigraphic or other sources.

had by now annexed all the important principalities in Rajasthan.

There are at least two invasions of Jalor known to us during the decade following the succession of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji. The first penetration of the Khalji forces into Jalor was conducted as early as the third year of Sultan Alaud-Din's reign.¹ The main object this time, however, was 'the invasion of Gujarat and with a view to the destruction of the celebrated shrine of Somnath.'²

According to Kanhadadeprabandha, the earliest known Rajasthan account,³ the Sultan who desired to march through Marwar, sent a robe of honour to the prince and desired the latter to allow him to pass through his territory without molestation.⁴

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 251; Khusrāu, however, gives 20th Jamadi-ul-Awwal 699 A.H., corresponding to 10th Feb., 1300 A.D. (Khusrāu, K.F., text, p. 80). Barani is supported by Jinaprabha (I.A., 1897, pp. 184-95) and Wassaf, Zafar-ul-Walīh (i.e. Zil Hijjah, A.H. 698/Aug., 1299 A.D.).

۲. "بر سریت کبریا" تجربات و کرباب کردن مبتدیان و معونات

Khursai, K.P., text, p. 50.
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ १ ॥
 Padmanabh, K.P., Vol. I, p. 36.

3. Kanhadadeprabandha (completed V.S. 1512) is perhaps the most valuable treasure in old Gujarati or old Western Rajasthani. From the historical point of view also, the Prabandha 'is perhaps the only one which gives an accurate account of historical events. There is hardly any doubt that the poet has drawn at first hand on court-records and chronicles as well as the current historical traditions of Rajasthan'.
Padmanabha, K.P., Int., p. 1.

4. Ibid., Canto I, verse 29.

The necessary permission, however, was refused, yet the haughty and arrogant reply of prince Kanhada Deva did not result in immediate action against his kingdom. Nusrat Khan, the commander of the Delhi troops, during the invasion of Gujarat,¹ perhaps thought it better to proceed directly to the kingdom of Gujarat than to be diverted towards Jalor.² The royal troops marched through Vagad, Modasa and Asavalli, i.e. the territories of the Guhila chief.³

In the return journey, the army took the route of Marwar. It is difficult to ascertain if Ulugh Khan had any special instructions from the centre, to punish the Jalor chief,⁴ or the victorious army carrying much spoils

1. Khusrav, K.E., pp. 50-52; Barani, T.E.S., p. 251; Isami, E.S., pp. 252-53; Padmanabh, K.P., Canto I, verses 3-27.
2. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto I, verses 50-51.

"आज नि धिने वागदु तावित्र : दीधी वाट म्मारनी राउल भाव्ये,
 राउल बिगाम । मुजरालि बंछुडि, पडुंय तलबज, पडिउ रात ॥"

i.e. 'next day he (Nusrat Khan), reached Vagad (Marwar). Rawal Samar Simha blocked the route. He (thereupon) went towards Katak Binas (i.e. Banas river) and then reached Bambavda in Gujarat. The forces suddenly caused havoc there'.
3. For a vague reference to the Khalji Commander's encounter with Guhila Samar Simha during the former's march to Gujarat, see Ranakpur temple inscription of V.S. 1496. A.R.E.M., 1920-21, p. 4; Shymal Dass, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 409-10; P.C.Nahar, J.L.S., Vol. I, pp. 165-66.
4. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 160.

wanted to avoid another possible encounter with the hostile Mewar rulers. It seems that the shortest route was followed as a matter of exigency.

A serious uprising in the army itself took place while the Delhi army during its return journey, was encamped near Jalor. Barani states that 'Ulugh Khan and Nusrat Khan returned with great booty (from Gujarat), but on their way they provoked their soldiers to revolt by demanding from the¹ one-fifth of their spoil and by instituting from inquisitional inquiries about it. Various kinds of coercion were employed (which) drove the 'Neo-Muslim's to desperation. Two or three thousand of them assembled and began a disturbance.¹

The mutineers succeeded in killing Malik Azizud-Din, brother of Nusrat Khan and Amir-i-Hajib of Ulugh Khan, and even proceeded tumultuously to the tent of Ulugh Khan, The Prince, however, escaped and reached the camp of Nusrat Khan. But the Neo-Muslims killed a son of the Sultan's sister. The disturbance now became very widespread and almost the whole army was involved. 'But as Sultan Alaud-Din's power was destined to increase', writes the chronicler, 'soon good fortune prevailed.' The rebellious Amirs and horsemen of the 'Neo-Muslims' dispersed and those who had

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 252;
Isami, F.S., text, pp. 254-55.

taken leading part in the disturbances fled to join the Rais and Ranas.¹

Although Barani does not refer to Chauhan participation in the Jalor mutiny, yet the traditional accounts refer to a Chauhan raid over the royal forces, at a time when the mutiny was spreading in the royal tents.²

This seems to be partly correct in view of the fact that some Mongol chiefs actually took shelter with the Rais and Ranas of the adjoining territories soon after the mutiny.³

-
1. Isami, F.S., text, pp. 254-55. Yalchak and Barq fled to Rai Karan while Qamisi Muhammad Shah and Kabhru took shelter with Rana Hammira of Ranthambhor.
 2. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto I, verses 194-96, states that when the Khalji forces encamped at Sirana (Sakarana by Nainsi, Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 158) which still exists near Jalor, Jaita Deva, the envoy of Kanhada Deva delivered his master's message to Ulugh Khan that the latter had not done well in encamping at the foot of this fort after the loot and massacre at Somnath. Nainsi adds that the 'Neo-Muslims' assembled and raided the royal camp. (Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, pp. 158-60). The failure of the mutiny ultimately seems to have compelled the mutineers to seek shelter with the Rais of Gujarat, Jalor and Ranthambhor.
 3. Barani, T.F.S., p. 252; Isami, F.S., pp. 254-55. The Rajput chronicles claim that thousands of Hindu prisoners were freed and their most brilliant feat was the rescue of the idol of Somnath from the hands of the Muslims who were carrying it to Delhi to be trodden under the 'feet of the faithful'. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto I, pp. 220-221; Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, pp. 213, 335.

The 'Neo-Muslims' were severely punished. However, Kanhada Deva's hostile attitude did not attract the attention of the Sultan until 1305, when the Khalji troops under Ainul-Mulk Multani, were despatched to invade Jalor. Later Rajput accounts refer to Kanhada Deva's accepting the suzerainty of the Sultan and his visit to the court of Alaud-Din Khalji.¹ Ferishta states that the Jalor chief left the Sultan's court, when the latter one day boastfully remarked that there was no Indian prince who could challenge his forces.²

Since the last known inscription of Samanta Simha is dated V.S. 1362/1306 A.D.,³ it seems that Kanhada Deva was holding the administration of Jalor in his father's name at this time.

The challenge thus being accepted by the Jalor chief, now started the Sultan's invasion against the Sonigara kingdom. The Delhi troops marched towards Siwana, a fortress lying at a distance of about thirty miles from Jalor where Satal Deva, the governor of the place was killed and the fort annexed to the Khalji empire.⁴

1. Virande Sonigara ki Bat, (pp. 85-86) states that Kanhada Deva sent his son Virana Deva as a hostage to the Sultan's court.

2. Ferishta, I.F., text, p. 118.

3. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 159, fn. 1.

4. For details, see Supra, pp. 181-185.

The Sultan after the capture of Siwana, left for Delhi but instructed his commanders to subjugate the neighbouring principalities. His orders were carried out effectively and Marwar was sacked. Another contingent captured Barmer¹ and destroyed the Mahavira temple of Sanchor.²

The plunder and the devastation by the Muslim forces in Rajasthan was an open insult to the last surviving prominent Chauhhan chief, who according to the traditional accounts, invited assistance from the various other Rajput clans.³

The Delhi army on the other hand sacked Bhinmal and made a number of Brahmans captives.⁴ The combined forces of the Rajputs, at the orders of Kanhada Deva, came into

1. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto III, verse 29.
2. Suri, Vividhatirthakalpa, p. 30.
3. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto III, pp. 69-71.

4. "ਪਾਲਿ ਸਾਹਿਬੀ ਅਤੇ ਬਾਨ ਦੇਵਰਾ ਮਰਿ ਕੀਧਿਤੁ ਤਪਧਾਨ ਬਾਹਿਯ, ਅਤੇ ਸ਼ੁਕੀਤੁ ਆਤਮਾ . ॥"

Padmanabh, K.P., Canto III, verse 34 and

"...मन्त्रमालां ज्ञात्वा ब्रह्म/३१ फेरि वर पद/३ माह, पद्य
विदित् अस्मां माह..." **ibid., verses 30-31.**

A later inscription dated V.S. 1444/1387-88 A.D., from Sanohar and belonging to Pratapa Simha, the great grandson of Salha, records that Salha liberated the people which were taken captive by the Turushkas at Srimala.

"गुरु-एव चैव त्वं पि त्वं नानि नामानि नाप्यङ्गुलि-रश्मयः॥"
R.I., Vol. XI, p. 66.

action and encountered the Muslims at Khudala.¹ The Rajputs under two Devada commanders Jaita and Mahipala,² along with many other chiefs, got the upper hand in the initial battle with the Muslims. Malik Naib, however, was not present in this battle and had been out for hunting. After the above victory, both the generals, leaving a detachment of about 4000 Rajputs, rushed to Jalor to inform to their overlord Kanhada Deva of the victory.³

However, the Chauhan victory was short lived. Soon the Muslim, through a strategem⁴ won the day and succeeded in besieging the fort of Jalor.⁵ The siege seems to have

1. Padmanabha, K.P., Canto III, pp. 69-71.

2. Ibid., pp. 36, 89.

3. Ibid., p. 94.

4. The details given by Padmanabh are almost the same as mentioned in Hammiramahakavya. See Padmanabh, K.P., Canto III, verses 94-105.

5. Ferishta refers to a very interesting yet unconfirmed statement that the Sultan enraged at the provocative reply of the prince Kanhada Deva, during his stay at Sultan Alaud-Din's court, despatched Muslim forces under Gul-i-Bihisht, one of the concubines. She is reported to have put a valiant siege and the fortress was about to be captured when she, all of a sudden fell ill and died. Her place was taken over by her son Shahin, who also continued the siege, but was killed in an engagement. This resulted in Muslim forces' retreat to a safer place. (Ferishta T.F., text, p. 118, tr. pp. 370-71). Cf. Tarikh-i-Alfi (c. 1585), which seems to be the source of Ferishta. Serious doubts have been raised as regards the authenticity of the above statement. It is very doubtful if Khalji commanders would have served willingly under a concubine or her son. (K.S.Lal, Khaljis, p. 137, fn. 21). It has also been suggested that the story is purely a late fabrication designed to cover the Sultan's disgrace. Hodiwala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 52.

been a prolonged one and it is certain that the royal forces met a number of reverses during the initial stages.

The Kanhadadeprabandha mentions in detail the defence preparations carried on by Virama Deva and Maladeva (the son and the brother of Kanhada Deva respectively) for a full week.¹ In another engagement, the Muslim commander Shams Khan and his wife were captured alive by the Rajput forces at Moklana, near Merta. The tension rose very high now and the Sultan in 1310, under a well equipped force, marched in person towards the fortress. The Muslim commander Kamalud-Din pressed² the siege vigorously. Kanhada Deva, on the other hand, despatched two battalions under Maladeva and Virama Deva to check the Khalji progress.

It seems that all the Rajput efforts this time, proved of no avail and Kamalud-Din pressed the siege very hard and subjected the garrison to starvation and utmost misery.³

1. Padmenabh, K.P., Canto III, verse 170.

2. Ibid., Canto IV, verses 63, 200, 254;
Ferishta, T.E., text, p. 118, tr., p. 371.

3. The siege, according to Viramde Sonigara ki Bat, continued for full one year:

"... पालिसाह मास ? बांडासु आलोरे नेडा ने लो ४ उरे डरो दीया ।
कोरया मजाफा नालीफा चाढी , जहरे आल फास कोजा लागी , बरस
१ राति हुडे । एक हाथ आबगरा देडा बांडे नही , लरे पालिसाह
बलदा (५०० बलायने) जहरे सुरेज , पराब ... "
Ibid., text, p. 93.

The final blow was caused by Bika, a Dahiya Rajput who dressing of the kingdom of Jalor for himself, went over to the side of the Sultan¹ and acted as a guide to show the Khalji troops an unguarded passage to the fortress. The fate of the fort being sealed, Kanhada Deva's Sementas, Kandhal, Jaita, Ulichha, Jaita Devada, Luna Karam, Molhana, Arjun Badaval and a host of others, led the final attack on the Muslim forces and were killed in defence of the fortress.² Finally flames of Jauhar rose high, in which the queens of Sonigara chief consigned themselves.³ Kanhada Deva came out of the fortress along with fifty officers, including Virama Deva and died fighting against the imperial forces.⁴

The event must have occurred sometime after V.S. 1368/1311-12 A.D.⁵

-
1. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto IV, verse 183.
 2. Cf. Viramde Sonigara ki Bat, pp. 96.
 3. Padmanabh, K.P., Canto IV, pp. 215-250.
 3. Ibid., pp. 248-49. "युद्ध रम्य च ३२१५१ अंगहर जग गोमोह
निवेष्ट १ लोच सेव अंगहर युद्ध है अंगहरि अरुद्ध युद्ध ॥"
 4. Ibid., pp. 249-50; Cf. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 263. Viramde Sonigara Ki Bat; P.I.H.C., 1951, pp. 329-34.
 5. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 204, Vol. III, p. 184; Tirtha-kalpa states that in V.S. 1367/1310 A.D., Alaud-Din destroyed the temple of Mahavira at Sanchor, which perhaps was a part of larger enterprise i.e. of Jalor. Kanhadadeprabandha, Vol. IV, p. 260; Khartaragachohha-pattavali, text, p. 64. See also Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, (Hindi), p. 15. To commemorate the victory, Sultan Alaud-Din is said to have erected a mosque in Songir fort, at Jalor now called 'Topkhana'. K.S.Lal., History of Khaljis, p. 138, fn. 25.

Khalji inscriptions
from Rajasthan:

To complete the account of Khalji hold over the various Rajput principalities in Rajasthan, it would not be out of place here to mention in brief, the epigraphic evidence available so far.

A large number of epigraphs are available for the period under review. These inscriptions, apart from providing the chronology of the period, are also significant in determining the extent of the Khalji influence in Rajasthan. Broadly speaking they can be classified into three distinct categories.

First, Persian inscriptions, which undoubtedly prove that the Khalji's succeeded in exerting their influence partly or wholly at least over the area of the find-spot of the epigraph. This is true in many cases where the inscriptions record the construction of Mosques or other edifices by individual Muslims, who might have held a respectable position or effective authority in the region around the find-spot of the epigraph.

Secondly, the Sanskrit inscriptions. These may further be subdivided into three different classes

viz:

- (a) Inscriptions eulogising the Khalji rulers. The inscriptions of this type may well be put alongside the Persian inscriptions since they definitely suggest the subjugation of the local Rajput chiefs and their accepting the suzerainty of the Khalji rulers.
- (b) A set of Sanskrit epigraphs, some contemporary and the others near contemporary, praise particular Rajput chiefs as having either maintained their independent status or defeated the invading Khalji forces.
- (c) The last category of the Sanskrit epigraphs which are undoubtedly greater in number, record the geneologies of the various local Rajput dynasties in Rajasthan and seem to be unmindful of the powerful Khalji sovereign at Delhi.

A study of the available Persian epigraphs from Rajasthan shows that regions like Bayana, Jalor, Mandor and Chittor etc., were or had come under the Khalji control.¹

1. For details see M.S. Ahluwalia, Muslim penetration into Rajasthan - A Study based on epigraphic evidence. P.I.H.C., (Mysore, 1966), pp. 144-51.

A number of mosques built in the territory of Bayana bear testimony to the fact that the place was under the effective control of the Khalji rulers. Qasim Ki Masjid in Bayana, recording the date of its erection as A.H. 705/1305 A.D.,¹ is undoubtedly a Khalji monument.

Two more inscriptions from Bayana, one from the Jhalar Baoli (about two miles north of Bayana,) and the Ukha Masjid, dated A.H. 718 and 720/1318 and 1320 A.D. respectively record the construction of these edifices by Kafur, servant of the Court, during the reign of Sultan Mubarakshah.²

The territory of Mewar, with its capital at Chittor was subjugated in 1303.³ No less than three fragmentary inscriptions have been found from Chittor belonging to the

1. G.Yasani, E.I.M., 1917-18; Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 76.
2. E.I.M., 1917-18, p. 40; Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 70-71. There is another short inscription on the north eastern door-way of the Baoli which is in Sanskrit and refers to the name of a Rajput and dated Tuesday, the bright fortnight of Vaisakha, V.S. 1325/1268 A.D., which shows that some portion of the door on which the inscription is carved originally belonged to an old Hindu temple. Yasani, E.I.M., 1917-18, p. 39.
3. Amir Khusrau, K.F., text, p. 64-78; tr. Habib, pp. 48-50; Khusrau, Deval Rani Khizr Khan, text, pp. 66-67; Isami, E.S., pp. 280-81.

reign of Alaud-Din Khalji.¹ The most significant inscription from Chittor is dated 10th Zil Hijjah, A.H. 709/13th May, 1310² which refers to the Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji as the ruler of Chittor and thus proves that Chittor was not evacuated by the imperial armies at least up to 1310. This is further supported by two near contemporary records from Chittor. The inscriptions prove the control of the Sultans of Delhi over Chittor and refute the story of Alaud-Din's recall of prince Khizr Khan from Chittor and his replacement by Maldeva Chauhan, defeat of the latter or his son, etc.³

Another fragmentary inscription records that Malik Asadud-Din built the Mosque during the reign of Muhammad Tughluq. Malik Asadud-Din Arslan is apparently the nephew of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq and was appointed as Naib Barbak in A.H. 720/1320 A.D., the year of the Sultan's accession to the throne. From this as well as the second inscription found from 'Ghaibi Pir' Tomb at Chittor, it is certain that Malik Asadud-Din or some other Turkish noble was already governor during the pre-Tughluq period, since

1. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, p. 68, fn. 5.

2. A.R.I.E., 1956, Appdx. 'C', No. 126;
G.H.Ojha, H.R.I., p. 173.

3. Ibid., pp. 189, 198, 233; Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 67-68.

a fresh appointment would necessarily imply reconquest of Chittor by the Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq, which is nowhere recorded.¹

Almost the entire territory of the present Marwar was in the possession of Khalji Sultans as would be seen from the available epigraphic evidence. As early as 1293 we find a Mosque in Mander (Jodhpur), with an epigraph of Sultan Jalalud-Din Khalji which probably refers to his pali invasion of 1291,² after which the Mosque was apparently built.

Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji is said to have built a mosque in Jalor, now known as 'Topkhana', to commemorate his conquest of the region which is otherwise proved by many contemporary and later sources.³

Another inscription in a Mosque at Jalor, dated 5th Muharram, A.H. 718/Thursday, 9th March, 1318, records its erection by Nusrat Beg whose father or grand father held a prominent post at the court of Sultan Iltutmish.⁴

A number of inscriptions in Sanskrit found in different parts of Rajasthan record the achievements of

1. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 67-68.

2. B.N.Ren, Marwar ka Itihas (Hindi), p. 44.

3. A.S.I., 1930-31; For the conquest of Jalor by Sultan Alaud-Din, see Supra, pp. 186-197.

4. G.Yadani, E.I.M., 1935-36, pp. 49-50.

the Khalji rulers in laudatory terms. This naturally suggests that the Khalji emperors held effective control over these principalities. This is true particularly in the cases ^{of} Jaipur and the Jodhpur regions.

A slab in the village well in Pandukha (Phalodi, in Jodhpur) and dated V.S. 1358/1302 A.D., begins with invocations to several gods and goddesses and then refers to the region of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, who had established at Madnatha (Merta) his viceroy known as Tajud-Din Ali, whose long Persian titles have been given in a Sanskritised form.¹

Another well known inscription, dated V.S. 1373/1316 A.D., found from Ladnu (Jodhpur) gives a list of Delhi Sultans up to the reign of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji. About Alaud-Din it records that he was the first Sultan to conquer the south. The extent of his empire described in the epigraph too is fairly accurate.²

The region of Jodhpur seems to have continued in the possession of Sultan Alaud-Din's successor Mubarak Khalji

1. P.R. (W.G.), 1909-10, p. 61; Bhandarkar's List, No. 650, p. 92. As early as 1242, Malik Izzud-Din was in possession of Mandor, Nagaur and Ajmer etc. Mandor was invaded by Firuz Khalji (1293), who succeeded in capturing it perhaps from the Sonigara Chauhan Samanta Simha. After this Sultan Alaud-Din seems to have appointed R Tajud-Din as his viceroy in the neighbouring places like Merta. Ibid.

2. E.I., Vol. XII, p. 23; A.I.H., 1936, pp. 182-84.

as is recorded in an epigraph dated V.S. 1373.¹ The inscription apparently attests the acknowledgement of the over-lordship of the Khalji Sultans by the local Rathor chiefs.

An inscription from Jaipur (original find-spot unknown) dated V.S. 1362/1306 A.D.,² refers to Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji as Maharajadhiraja Srimad Alavadin, the destroyer of all the kings. The eulogistic description of the imperial ruler Alaud-Din and one Chauhan Bhoja Deva as his Mahakhadgadhara, does not seem to be a casual reference. Probably after the overthrow of the Ranthambhor Chauhan Hammira,³ one of the members of the fallen house accepted the suzerainty of the Sultan.⁴

At least three inscriptions from Jaisalmer, Mt. Abu and Udaipur respectively refer indirectly to the Khalji invasion or influence in these principalities. The Jaisalmer inscription refers to the illustrious king Rana Ratna's son Ghata Simha (whose last known date is 1361 A.D.), who like a lion tore asunder the elephant like Mlechchhas⁵ and snatched away Vapradari from them.

1. D.R.Bhandarkar's, List No. 672, pp- 94-95.

2. E.I., Vol. XX, 1953, pp. 189-90.

3. C.M.I.R., p. 63; I.I.R., 1936, p. 182.

4. For details, see 'Ranthambhor during 13th century', Proceedings of the Rajasthan History Congress, 1st session (Jodhpur, 1967), pp. 169-70.

5. See Supra, p. 180, fn. 1.

This might refer to the Khalji invasion of Jaisalmer, which is known also from the bardic literature.¹

The Mt. Abu (Ashleshwar) inscription dated V.S.1377/1320 A.D.² similarly refers to the Asuras (obviously the Khalji troops) who destroyed the Khshatriyas. The inscription further states that 'He (Lavanyakarna) devoted himself to the protection of his clansmen and their lands'. This probably refers to the events during and after the capture of Siwana³ and Jalor.⁴

A later inscription dated V.S. 1517/1460 A.D.⁵ (now in the Udaipur Museum), is quite significant. It is the only inscription recording to the events after the capture of Chittor by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji in 1303. It records that Maharana Lakshman Simha, one of the vassals of Chittor died fighting with his seven other sons in the battle of Chittor.

The last category of the Sanskrit epigraphs refer to the various chiefs over their respective territories

1. For the invasion of Jaisalmer by Alaud-Din Khalji, see Supra, pp. 178-81.
2. From G.H.Ojha's transcript, quoted and summarised by Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 175, 177-78.
3. For the conquest of Siwana, see Supra, pp. 181-85.
4. Supra, pp. 186-197.
5. A.S.I., 1925-26, p. 149 and Supra, p. 167, fn.1

and their geneologies without any reference to the political events or their relations with the central authority. At least two dozen such inscriptions ranging from V.S. 1345 to 1394 have come down to us from places like Bhinmal, Sanchor, Kota, Jodhpur, Dungarpur, Barmer, Bundi, Mt. Abu, and Sirohi. The Prasastikaras are very careful in avoiding a reference to the Khalji rulers and boastfully record those of their over-lords. These inscriptions leave uncertain the matters of the actual suzerainty of the Khaljis over these principalities.

A study of these epigraphs taken together, suggests that the principalities like Bayana, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Jalor, Mandor and Mewar, were under the direct control of the Khalji rulers. About such territories as Bhinmal, Kota, Dungarpur, Banswara, Barmer, Bundi and Sirohi nothing definite can be said, whereas Jaisalmer appears to have remained independent of Khalji influence.

*

CHAPTER * VII

THE NEW KINGDOMS OF
BUNDI & MARWARBundi:

The early history of the Hada Chauhans, who established themselves at Bundi,¹ during the period of the Sultans of Delhi, is closely associated with the Chauhans of Sakambhari, Nadol and Jalor, from whom they sprang during the middle of the fourteenth century.

Lakshmana, son of Vakpatiraja of Sakambhari, founded the kingdom of Nadol (in Marwar), sometime before V.S. 1039/983 A.D.², and the territory was held by the Chauhans at least up to V.S. 1258/1202 A.D., the last date of Samanta Simha's inscriptions.³

-
1. The territory of Bundi lies in the centre of Rajasthan. Before its foundation, the tract was called 'Harauti'. It lies 24°59' - 25°59' to the south-east and 75°18' - 76°21' to north. River Chambal lying to the east of Bundi, separates it from Kota.
 2. E.I., Vol. XI, p. 67.
 3. Samanta Simha's inscriptions range from V.S. 1256 to 1258/1200-1202 A.D. Out of his five available inscriptions, three have been found from Bannera (Jodhpur), one from Tuhman (Sirohi) and one from Sanderav (Jodhpur). See Bhandarkar's, List, p. 64.

It seems that after the attack of Qutubud-Din Aibak on Nadol, in 593/1197 A.D.,¹ the Chauhans under Kirtipala migrated towards Jalor, where the latter succeeded in founding the kingdom of Jalor.

The Chauhans of Bhinmal continued to hold the territory successfully under their rulers Manikraya, Sambhram, Jaitrao, Anangarao, Vijaypala, and Hararao² the last of whom is said to be the founder of Hada branch of the Chauhans.

According to the traditional accounts, Rao Deva Singh Hada, second in succession to Rao Hada, captured Bundi and its adjoining tract which later on came to be known as 'Haraoti', from the Minas³ sometime about

1. Supra, pp. 87-88.

2. Nainsi, N.K., p. 101.

3. According to Nainsi, the Mina chief intended to marry his son with one of daughters of a Brahman and the later, not willing to submit to this matrimonial alliance, sought the assistance of Rao Deva Singh. The marriage was agreed upon, but the Minas, who assembled at a certain fixed place for the purpose were, blown off with gun-powder, spread in the grass below their feet.

"... देवे रण्य दे ली ॥ १५५, सबल, बंधाय, १ गीत हो सार दृष्टाये ।"

(Nainsi, N.K., Ibid., p. 98). Cf. Vansabbhaskar, Vol. II, p. 1624, cited in J.S. Guhlilot, Rajputana ka Itihas (Hindi), Vol. II, p. 42. According to another version, Deva Singh Hada married his daughter with Kunwar Ari Singh, son of Rana Lakshman Simha and with his assistance, repulsed the Minas from Bundi.

"... देवे राजा अरली मखिली कोलदे बेटी दीकी थी ।"

Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 98. (Contd....)

V.S. 1398/1340-41 A.D.¹

The kingdom founded by the Hada Chauhan, remained either as an independent principality or under partial control of the Guhilot chiefs of Mewar, who in their inscriptions claim to have subjected its rulers.²

From pre-pages:

However, both these versions seem to be later fabrications. In the first place the use of gun-powder as early as the fourteenth century seems to be impossible. (M.L.Sharma, Kota Rajya ka Itihas, p. 58) and secondly, Rao Deva Singh's contemporary at the throne of Mewar was perhaps Rana Hammira (1383-1421 A.D.). The only possibility seems to be that the Hada chief might have got active assistance from the Mewar rulers in establishing himself over the territory of Bundi. Nainsi, N.K., Vol.I, p. 99.

1. Vansabhaskar, Vol. II, pp. 1626-27 gives the date as V.S. 1298/1241-42 A.D. But in view of the inscription of V.S. 1354/1298 A.D. belonging to Vijayapala, the great grand-father of Rao Deva Singh, the date of Bundi occupation may be about 1340-41, if we allow about 20 years period each to his grand-father and father. J.S. Guhilot, Rajputane ka Itihas, Vol. II, p. 43.
2. The inscription from Pringirishi dated V.S. 1486/1429 A.D. records the defeat of Rao Narapala (V.S. 1406-1427/1350-1371 A.D.) at the hands of Maharana Kshetra Simha, who annexed Bundi to his kingdom of Mewar. (Bhandarkar's, List, No. 765) Another epigraph, dated V.S. 1496/1440 A.D. found from Ranakpur (Marwar), boastfully records to have captured 'Harauti', and made its ruler his Samanta. (B.I., Vol. I, pp. 20-22). Nainsi also states that after marrying his daughter with Lakshmana son of Rana Ari Singh, Hada Chauhan Deva Singh became a Samanta of the Mewar chiefs.

"अपणारे सुज्जर जयते मेवास जे चारुअर अरु मज्जे,"
See also Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol.II, p. 106.

The first Muslim invasion of the territory of Bundi is recorded by Minhaj, who states that Malik Nasirud-Din Aitmur held the territories of Siwalik, Ajmer, Lava, Kasili and Sambhar, during the reign of Sultan Iltutmish. Some time after 625/1227-28 A.D., he proceeded against the Hindus of Bundi for a Jihad.¹ The expedition, however, failed since the Malik was drowned in an attempt to cross the river.²

Since the Hada Chauhans had not established themselves at Bundi, it seems that the expedition was directed against the Minas who then held the territory.³

There is another reference to an expedition against Bundi during the reign of Sultan Nasirud-Din Mahmud. Balban, while at his Iqta of Nagaur in 1253, is said to have proceeded to invade the territories of Ranthambhor, Bundi and Chittor.⁴

The chronicler, however, states that Ulugh Khan returned successfully to his Iqta of Nagaur, after defeating Rao Nahar Deo of Ranthambhor⁵ and makes no reference to his further operations. It is thus clear that Balban did

1. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 237.

2. Ibid., p. 237. The river referred to, is obviously Chambal which flows on the eastern side of the Bundi.

3. Supra, pp. 208-209.

4. Supra, pp. 123-124.

5. Minhaj, T.N., text, p. 299.

not proceed as far as Bundi and Chittor, and he returned only after an unsuccessful expedition against the Chauhans of Ranthambhor.

The traditional accounts refer to two Muslim invasions of the Hadas of Bundi. It is stated that Rao Deva Singh attended the court of Sultan Sikandar Lodi. This, however, is incorrect, as the dates of the Hada chief suggest that he must have been a contemporary of Sultan Muhammed Tughluq.¹

It is further stated that Rao Samar Simha (1343-46) died fighting against Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji at Bambavda.² However, like the earlier one, this statement too, seems to be a later fabrication, as Sultan Alaud-Din (1296-1316) ruled at least 27 years before Samar Simha.

It may thus be concluded that there was probably no encounter of any of the Hada successors of Bundi³ with the Sultans of Delhi; if any, these occurred only because they had to fight as feudatories of the Ranas of Mewar.⁴

-
1. Even if we accept the date of V.S. 1298/1241-42 A.D. as given by Vansabhasakar, Rao Deva Singh's contemporary at the throne of Delhi was Sultan Bahram Shah (1241-42).
 2. Vansabhasakar, Vol. III, p. 1678; Tod, Annals, Vol. III, pp. 1478-79,
 3. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, p. 106.
 4. For a list of the Hada Chauhans of Bundi, see separate table at p. 212.

TABLEGENEALOGY OF BUNDI CHIEFS

I.	Rao Deva Singh Hada ¹	V.S. 1398-1400
II.	Samar Simha ²	V.S. 1400-1403
III.	Rao Narpala ³	V.S. 1406-1427
IV.	Rao Hammira ⁴	V.S. 1445-1460
V.	Rao Vira Simha ⁵	V.S. 1460-1470
VI.	Rao Vairisala ⁶	V.S. 1470-1560
VII.	Rao Bhan Deo ⁷	V.S. 1516-1560
VIII.	Rao Narain Das ⁸	V.S. 1560-1584

-
1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 106;
Vamsabhasakar, Vol. II, pp. 1624-27;
Tod, Annals, Vol. III, p. 1465.
 2. Ibid., Vol. III, p. 1678-81.
 3. Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 1714, 1727, 1787.
For his supposed death in one of the
engagements against Sultan Alaud-Din,
see ibid.
 4. Bundi-ki-Tawarikh, cited in M.Habib
and K.A.Nizami (edt.), A comprehensive
History of India, Vol. V, p. 834, fn. 6.
 5. Vamsabhasakar, Vol. III, p. 1787.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Rajasthan District Gazetteer, Bundi, p. 36.
 8. Vamsabhasakar, Vol. III, pp. 2029, 2065.

Marwar:

The descendants of the Rashtrakuta¹ house of Kanauj are said to have established themselves around Pali, in Marwar, as a result of the Muslim occupation of their ancestral kingdom² and many chiefs including the founder of the principality of Marwar, Rao Sihaji, are said to have died fighting against the troops of Delhi.³

While these statements are based on tradition, subsequent struggles between the Rathors of Marwar and the Sultans of Delhi are recorded in Persian, and Rajasthani sources and are corroborated by inscriptions.

It would, however, be wrong to suggest that the whole of the present territory of Marwar was hostile to the Sultanate. Quite a large number of inscriptions found mostly in places like Manglana, Sadri, Pandukha, Mandor and Ladnu

-
1. The Rashtrakuta house of Kanauj was founded sometime before V.S. 1148/1089-90 A.D. by Chandradeva. (for his inscriptions see E.I., Vol. IX, pp. 302-05; I.H.Q., 1949, pp. 31-37). The dynasty ruled over Kanauj till the end of the 12th century. The last known ruler of this line was Harishchandra (1197) known from Machhli-shahr (Jaunpur) grant (E.I., Vol. X, pp. 93-100). For details see Roma Niyogi, History of the Gahadwala dynasty, pp.
 2. Ibid., pp. 29-38; H.C.Ray, D.H.N.I., Vol. I, p. 552; R.P.Tripathi, History of Kanauj, pp. 293-300.
 3. See Bithu (Pali) inscription of V.S. 1330/1273 A.D.; I.A., Vol. XL, p. 141.

indicate that the north-eastern parts of present Jodhpur were fully part of the Delhi Sultanate.¹

However, most of the southern and western regions appear to have remained almost unaffected by Muslim influence, as is suggested by the absence of Arabic and Persian inscriptions, and to the availability of a large number of local rulers' inscriptions, usually referring to the Sultans in hostile terms. It may be true that some of the Rathor chiefs settled in Marwar region even before the traditional migration of Rao Sihaji and his lieutenants. But most of his region, at least up to the first decade of the thirteenth century was in the possession of the Chauhans and other Rajput tribes.² The inscriptions show that most of the Marwar territories were held by the Chauhan chiefs until the early years of the Rathor settlement in that region. This may refute the story of

1. For details, see M.S.Ahluwalia, Studies in Medieval Rajasthan History, (Delhi, 1970), pp. 26-33.

2. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 799; B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 37-39. These places seem to have been in the possession of the Chauhans, firstly as Chaulukya feudatories and then in an independent capacity, as is evident from an inscription of V.S.1319/1263 A.D. of the period of Chauhan Chachiga Deva of Jalor, wherein it is recorded that his father Udaya Simha (1206-1250) held the territories of Nadol, Jalor, Mendor, Barmer, Ratanpur, Sanchor Surachand, Radhadhara, Ransi and Bhinmal etc. P.C.Nahar, J.L.S., Vol. I, p. 257; Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 561, pp. 79-80. Guhilas, similarly held the territory of Kheda, which is about 70 miles west of Pali. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 38, fn. 1.

Khyats about Rao Sihaji's extending his help to Pali and Bhinmal Brahmans and ultimately taking possession of these territories in reward.¹ Rao Sihaji, however, only partially succeeded in establishing his authority around the region of Pali, which he held till his death in V.S.1273/1215 A.D.²

By the close of the twelfth century, Chauhan Kelhana and Jayata Simha etc., held the territories of Pali and Nadol, as feudatories of the Chaulukyas of Gujarat. It seems probable that the Chauhans held Nadol at least up to V.S. 1283/1231 A.D. The Chauhan chief Kelhana and his younger brother Kirtipala fought against Muhammad of Ghor along with their over-lord Bhima II, near Kaydran village in the modern Sirohi.³

Similarly Jayata Simha, the son and successor of Chauhan Kelhana vacated his possessions of Pali and Nadol, and joined hands with Parmara Dharavarsha of Abu against the invading Turkish forces under Sultan Qutbud-Din Aibak.⁴ Both of them were defeated and probably slain in the battle.⁵

1. Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 37-39.

2. I.A., Vol. XL, p. 141.

3. Sundha hill inscription, see E.I., Vol. IX, p. 77. See also Supra, pp. 87-88.

4. Nizami, T.M., text, p. 411;
Supra, pp. 87-89.

5. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 140.

Again two inscriptions from Bamnera¹(Jodhpur) and Sanderev,² belonging to the reign of Maharana Samanta Simha and dated V.S. 1258/1202 A.D., testify to the Chauhan occupation of these territories.³

It is therefore, difficult to determine the exact places in Marwar over which Rao Sihaji held his sway. It was only under his successors that Rathors established themselves firmly in this region and carved out a compact and independent kingdom. In the light of the available evidence, it may be safely assumed that Iltutmish siezed the territories of Jalor, Nagaur and Mandor,⁴ from the hands of the local Chauhan and Parihara chiefs and not from Rao Sihaji who is said to have fought a battle against his contemporary Sultans down to Sultan Balban.

The earliest friendly reference to the Sultan from the Marwar region is found in Manglana inscription⁵ (as already cited) which contained a reference to the rule of Allahanadeva son of Gobinda⁶ of the Ranthambhor line. It

1. Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 444 and 447.

2. Ibid., No. 446.

3. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., pp. 138-40.

4. For Iltutmish's operations against Marwar principalities, see Supra, pp. 25-31.

5. I.A., Vol. XVI, p. 36; see also Supra, pp. 96-97.

6. Suri, H.M.K., text, p. 24; tr. I.A., 1879, p- 62.

hails the victorious reign of Sultan Iltutmish of Jognipura i.e. Delhi. The Sultan is also recorded in this inscription as the lord of Ghor and Ghazna. The object of the record is the construction of step-well (Baoli) by one Jaitra Simha a feudatory chief of Allahanadeva. The latter is mentioned in the inscription as the 'gadhapati' of the fort of Ranthambhor. Although the inscription in question has more relevance to the history of the Ranthambhor line of the Chauhans, it also indicates that Rathors possibly enjoyed an insignificant status in Marwar till at least the date of the inscription.

The Rathor settlers in Marwar, it seems, did not establish themselves firmly over the entire region of the present Marwar during the thirteenth century. That parts of this region were held by local chiefs notably the Chauhans is established from the Manglana inscription.¹

Rao Asthan, the son and successor of Rao Sihaji reportedly extended his principality as far as Khed in the Malani district by defeating the Guhilas and wrested Idar from its Bhil Chief.² Traditional accounts state that Rao Asthan fell fighting against a Turkish invasion.³

1. For details see also M.S.Ahluwalia, 'Marwar and the Sultans of Delhi - A Study based on epigraphic evidence', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, Jaipur, 1968, pp. 51-54.

2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 55-57.

3. Ibid.

The policy of expansion and consolidation of the territories seems to have continued by the Rathor chiefs in the fourteenth century also. Rai Duhar, Rao Raypal, Rao Karampala, Bhima, Rao Chhada, Rao Tida and Rao Mallinatha, are traditionally ascribed to have fought against the neighbouring Pariharas, Paramaras, Bhatias, Sonigara and Deora Chauhans, Solankis and even Muslim rulers of Sindh and Malwa and Turkish forces.¹

By the close of the fourteenth century, the Rathors under Rao Chunda had not only successfully resisted the attacks of the Muslim rulers of Malwa and Gujarat but even conducted operations against the Tughluq Governors and occupied Khatu, Didwana, Sambhar, Nagaur and Ajmer.²

*

1. I.A., December, 1911; Bankidas, Aitihāsik Bāten, Nos. 1614, 1672; Dayal Das, Khyat, Vol. I, p. 64; Bankidas, Khyat, Nos. 784, 786; G.H.Ojha, Jodhpur Rajya ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 185-91.

2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 87-93; Bankidas, Aitihāsik Bāten, Nos. 637, 792, 681; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, pp. 803-04.

CHAPTER * VIII

THE BARWARS

The origin of Hasan, an Indian Muslim, who acquired sovereignty in A.H. 720/1320 A.D. under the title of Nasirud-Din Khusrau Shah,¹ at Delhi, has been a topic of much controversy. Amir Khusrau and Barani, the contemporary chroniclers, described him as a 'Barwar' and 'Barwari' respectively. Isami called him 'Parao', Yahya 'Baraun Bachha' and 'Barwar', Badauni and Ferishta 'Parwaz', and Abul Fazl 'Parwar'.² Many of these forms could be mere scribes' variants of the same name.

The origin and native place of Khusrau Khan, however, has been left ^{un-}described by these writers and the different

1. Yahya, T.M.S., gives A.H. 721/1321 A.D. as the date of Nasirud-Din's death. However, the coins of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din, bearing the date A.H. 720/1320 A.D. are available. N.Wright Catalogue of Coins in Indian Museum Calcutta, Vol. II, p. 48; E.Thomas, Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 193; Isami, (F.S., text, p. 367) gives A.H.719 as the date of Nasirud-Din's accession.
2. Khusrav, Tugh.N., text, p. 19;
 Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 381-390;
 Isami, F.S., text, p. 372;
 Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 85;
 Badauni, M.T., text, p.
 Ferishta, T.F., text, p.
 Nizamud-Din, T.A., text, p. 87.

versions about the name have misled many scholars, who taking the word as 'Parwari', labelled Khusrau as an 'individual of low caste'.¹

There is, however, nothing in the Persian chronicles to warrant Khusrau's belonging to 'one of those castes, whose touch is pollution to a Hindu'.² According to Barani, Khusrau Khan, whose earlier name was Hasan, had been brought up by Malik Shadi, Deputy Hajib.³ Yahya is the only chronicler, who states that he was captured along with his brother during the sack of Malwa.⁴

1. For the meaning of Marathi word 'Parwari', see Molesworth's Marathi English Dictionary, second edition, p. 492.
2. Briggs, the translator of Tarikh-i-Ferishta, writes in a note, 'The Parwari is a Hindu out-caste who eats flesh of all kinds and is deemed so unclean as not to be admitted to built a house within the town.' (T.F., tr., Vol. I, p. 387, fn.). See also E. Thomas, Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 184, n ; W. Haig, Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 120. Among the Indian writers supporting the above views, are Ishwari Prasad, who concludes that 'Khusrau's character condemned by all historians is thoroughly un-Rajput like.' History of the Qaraunah Turks in India, pp. 8-11, n.21. Agha Mahdi Husain, opines that 'Barwar is probably a misprint of Parwar', Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughluq, p. 28, n.
3. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 381.
4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 86. reads:
 در عهد مغولیت خسرو خان و برادر داریجهت باوه به دست لشکر اسلام اسیر گشت //

He might have been brought to the court between 1299 and 1306. I.H.Q., Vol. XXVI, 1950, p. 27.

Soon after the accession of Sultan Mubarak Khalji, Hasan became the favourite of the Sultan and the latter not only conferred the title of Khusrau Khan on him but even appointed him in charge of the forces and the Iqta of the late Naib.¹

He not only acted as prime minister of Sultan Mubarak Khalji but even successfully led the royal army to the South.² His brother Hasamud-Din likewise, was appointed Naib of Gujarat after Zafar Khan's assassination.³

The later story of Khusrau Khan's conspiracy and his assassination of Sultan Mubarak Khalji⁴ is too well known to detain us here. Barani's 'exaggerated denunciations'⁵ cannot, of course, lead us to declare a lowly origin for Khusrau Khan. Similarly the 'ugly and repulsive side of Khusrau's character' can not lead us to condemn it as

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 381.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 381, 392.

3. Ibid., text, p. 406. His Hindu name has been given as Randhol.

4. Ibid., pp. 402-09; Khusrau, Tugh. N., pp. 17-20; Isami, F.S., text, pp. 372-73.

5. دایں خسرو خان بہر آؤیہ کساری دینداری و فیسی ویدر اصلی بود است۔ دایں چنان غلامیہ ویدر آؤیہ۔
والد الزمان از قوت بہر آؤیہ ویدر دایں بہر تکت طبعی و طبیعت۔

Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 391-410.

'thoroughly un-Rajputlike'.¹

There is nothing in Barani or Amir Khusrau's work to show that Khusrau Khan and his brethren were out-caste or unclean or that they lacked the qualities of administration and fighting skill. Khusrau Khan, soon after Mubarak Khalji's accession became his Commander-in-Chief² and led successful campaigns in the south.³ The Sultan raised him to dignity and distinction higher than had ever been attained by Malik Naib Kafur.⁴

All the Persian chroniclers depict Khusrau Khan and his men as brave fighters. Amir Khusrau remarks, 'Barwaris are a fighting race among Hindus, who carry on the business of fighting and lay down their lives for the Hindu Rajs and Ranes.'⁵ Isami calls Khusrau Khan as a

1. Ishwari Prasad, History of the Qaraunah Turks in India, pp. 8-11, fn. 21.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 390.

3. Ibid., text, p. 391; Khusrau, Tugh. N., p. 18; Ibn Batuta, Travels, E. & D., Vol. III, pp. 605-06; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 85.

4. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 391-92.

5. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, p. 18.

برآورد وصف هندو پست سر باز - کہ ہم سر باز با شدیم سر انداز
 بوہنہ میں دیکھیں رہاں - کہ جہاں بازند سر فرماں رواں رہاں -

Hindu of Prao tribe, who lived in Gujarat.¹ Ibn Batuta also pays tribute to Khusrau Khan by writing of him as 'brave and handsome.'²

Khusrau Khan's assumption of sovereignty for a short period in A.H. 720/1320 A.D. after assassination of his benefactor (for which he has been severely condemned by Barani) was not altogether a new feature in the fourteenth century politics, for it had been practised at least possibly by Balban as well.

After becoming ruler, Khusrau Khan, who titled himself 'Nasirud-Din', scattered wealth like Alaud-Din to win the support of nobles and of a section of which he certainly secured. There are instances to show that Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq was not actually assisted by the Muqtis of Multan, Siwana, Samana and Jalor when he appealed to them to send forces in a bid to oust 'the usurper.'³ Khusrau, however, could not expect any support from the Hindu Rais

1. Ibid, text., p. 19. Barani also at one place called Barwaris, as 'Fidais' which testify Khusrau's description of Barwaris as brave fighters. (S.M.Haq, Barani's History of Tughluq, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, p. 28, n. 3. See also Yahya, T.M.S., p. 91.

2. Isami, F.S., text, p. 372.

3. Isami, F.S., p. 62; Khusrau, Tugh. N., p. 48.

and Ranas, who refused to accept him as their over-lord under these circumstances.¹

Khusrau's failure lay perhaps more because of his unpopularity among the Turkish nobles and Hindu Rais and Ranas due to above reasons rather than his low origin.

The whole 'antagonism' of Barani was owing to the so-called 'revival of Hinduism' under Khusrau Khan,² and so also of the later writers, who ^h charged Khusrau of being half-Hindu, insulting Islam and promoting idol-worship in the place,³ which surely was a right denied to the filthy, low born, or polluted Shudra of the fourteenth century.

Khusrau Khan was in fact an Indian Muslim converted from a noble Hindu family, who by sheer dint of his power came to occupy the sovereignty of India. He seems to have belonged to an area somewhere on the border of Malwa and

1. S.B.P.Nigam, Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, p. 73.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 385. The chronicler further states that it brought a favourable period to the Hindus. Because of the low rate of Kharaj, the Hindus in general became prosperous, started wearing fine fabrics, riding horses and using bows and arrows etc. Ibid., text, p. 385-

3. Nizamud-Din, T.A., text, Vol. I, p. 93.

سوم خردون رونق درون نما پيدا كرد. بت بهتري و تزيين بساجد نتايج شد.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 126.

Gujarat.¹

It was the term Barwar, Baradu, Parau, Parwar and Parwari, which became a victim to the Persian script and perhaps for this reason some later authorities described Hasan as a pahlwan (wrestler)² and darban (door-keeper).³ Neither of these two posts were necessarily lowly.

Khusrau Shah was able to seat himself on the throne of Delhi, though for a short period, through his personal bravery as well as the support and co-operation of a martial race of Hindu community which has been described as 'bravest and greatest'⁴ and which fought with greatest fury in defeating and pillaging Tughluq's camp.⁵

The real tribe or caste to which Khusrau belonged was left largely unexplored by many a modern writers,⁶ due to the obvious difficulties. One such has adopted a middle course and has ventured to identify Barwari, with Bharwar,

1. Isami, F.S., text, p. 372. In order to carry out his plans, he begged the permission of Mubarak Shah to call some of his connections from Bahlawal (بہاول) and the country of Gujarat. Barami, T.F.S., p. 402. The place has been identified by Hodivala as either Nahrwala or Bhinmal, the last of which place lies about 50 miles west of Abu and was ruled over by the Paramara Rajputs. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 288.

2. Ferishta, T.F., text, p. 126. ^{124.}

3. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 82.

4. Ibn Batuta, Travels, tr. E & D., Vol. III, p. 604.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 91.

6. See op.cit., Hodivala, K.S.Lal and Sri Ram Sharma.

which in Gujarati language means a shepherd¹ and who abound in Gujarat. But the innumerable references to their fighting skill and utmost bravery undoubtedly places Hasan and his men as belonging to a martial and organised tribe rather than to the community of shepherds.

The area of Malwa and eastern Gujarat, to which place Hasan and his men belonged, leads one to postulate their Paramara origin.

Paramara, misread as Parwar and Barwar 'p' and 'b' being often indistinguishable in Persian writing, is a well known Rajput tribe which established its hold over Malwa²

-
1. Jodnikosh of D.B.Kalekar, Published by Gujarat Vidyapeeth. Cited in A.L.Srivastava, I.H.Q., 1954, pp. 22-23.
 2. See also Mirat-i-Ahmadi, tr. James Bird, History of Gujarat, p. 167 and Bayley, Local Muhammadan Dynasties, p. 41, n. It has, however, been suggested that the Paramara origin of Khusrau Khan is not a sound theory. Firstly, Paramara, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in Persian script can never be read as Parwar and secondly had Khusrau Shah really been a Paramara, he would have been like the Sesodias, Rathors, Kachhwahas and the Chauhans etc., designated by a general term 'Rajput', with which the medieval Muslim writers were so intimately familiar. (I.H.Q., 1954, p. 21). Regarding the first objection it has been already stated that Khusrau and Isami etc., who wrote poetry were never careful about the term as such. The Barwar of Barsani and Badauni can be read as Parmar. Secondly the Persian writers of the 14th century were no doubt familiar with the terms Chauhans, Rathor and Kachhwaha etc., but not with the general term 'Rajput' which is not traceable in Barani, Isami or Ibn Batuta.

and Abu region, with Bhinmal as their capital in the early eleventh century.¹ After its sack by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji in 1306, a number of local inhabitants were converted to Islam, which ultimately led to a class of Muslim Officers (centurions) who later on began to look upon these territories as their prized possessions. Perhaps Hasan and his men were members of good stock and of the above mentioned royal race.

*

1. See two Kiradu stone inscriptions of V.S. 1198 and V.S. 1218 respectively. I.A., Vol.LX I, p. 135. See also Pratipal Bhatia, The Paramaras, (Delhi, 1970), pp. 182-85.

CHAPTER * VIII

THE BARWARS

The origin of Hasan, an Indian Muslim, who acquired sovereignty in A.H. 720/1320 A.D. under the title of Nasirud-Din Khusrau Shah,¹ at Delhi, has been a topic of much controversy. Amir Khusrau and Barani, the contemporary chroniclers, described him as a 'Barwar' and 'Barwari' respectively. Isami called him 'Parao', Yahya 'Baraun Bachha' and 'Barwar', Badauni and Ferishta 'Parwaz', and Abul Fazl 'Parwar'.² Many of these forms could be mere scribes' variants of the same name.

The origin and native place of Khusrau Khan, however, has been left ^{un-}described by these writers and the different

1. Yahya, T.M.S., gives A.H. 721/1321 A.D. as the date of Nasirud-Din's death. However, the coins of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din, bearing the date A.H. 720/1320 A.D. are available. N.Wright Catalogue of Coins in Indian Museum Calcutta, Vol. II, p. 48; E.Thomas, Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 193; Isami, (F.S., text, p. 367) gives A.H.719 as the date of Nasirud-Din's accession.
2. Khusrav, Tugh.N., text, p. 19;
 Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 381-390;
 Isami, F.S., text, p. 372;
 Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 85;
 Badauni, M.T., text, p.
 Ferishta, T.F., text, p.
 Nizamud-Din, T.A., text, p. 87.

versions about the name have misled many scholars, who taking the word as 'Parwari', labelled Khusrau as an 'individual of low caste'.¹

There is, however, nothing in the Persian chronicles to warrant Khusrau's belonging to 'one of those castes, whose touch is pollution to a Hindu'.² According to Barani, Khusrau Khan, whose earlier name was Hasan, had been brought up by Malik Shadi, Deputy Hajib.³ Yahya is the only chronicler, who states that he was captured along with his brother during the sack of Malwa.⁴

1. For the meaning of Marathi word 'Parwari', see Molesworth's Marathi English Dictionary, second edition, p. 492.
2. Briggs, the translator of Tarikh-i-Ferishta, writes in a note, 'The Parwari is a Hindu out-caste who eats flesh of all kinds and is deemed so unclean as not to be admitted to built a house within the town.' (T.F., tr., Vol. I, p. 387, fn.). See also E. Thomas, Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 184, n ; W. Haig, Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 120. Among the Indian writers supporting the above views, are Ishwari Prasad, who concludes that 'Khusrau's character condemned by all historians is thoroughly un-Rajput like.' History of the Qaraunah Turks in India, pp. 8-11, n.21. Agha Mahdi Husain, opines that 'Barwar is probably a misprint of Parwar', Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughluq, p. 28, n.
3. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 381.
4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 86. reads:
 در عهد مغولیت خسرو خان و برادر داریجیت باو به دست لشکر اسلام اسیر گشت //

He might have been brought to the court between 1299 and 1306. I.H.Q., Vol. XXVI, 1950, p. 27.

Soon after the accession of Sultan Mubarak Khalji, Hasan became the favourite of the Sultan and the latter not only conferred the title of Khusrau Khan on him but even appointed him in charge of the forces and the Iqta of the late Naib.¹

He not only acted as prime minister of Sultan Mubarak Khalji but even successfully led the royal army to the South.² His brother Hasamud-Din likewise, was appointed Naib of Gujarat after Zafar Khan's assassination.³

The later story of Khusrau Khan's conspiracy and his assassination of Sultan Mubarak Khalji⁴ is too well known to detain us here. Barani's 'exaggerated denunciations'⁵ cannot, of course, lead us to declare a lowly origin for Khusrau Khan. Similarly the 'ugly and repulsive side of Khusrau's character' can not lead us to condemn it as

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 381.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 381, 392.

3. Ibid., text, p. 406. His Hindu name has been given as Randhol.

4. Ibid., pp. 402-09; Khusrau, Tugh. N., pp. 17-20; Isami, F.S., text, pp. 372-73.

5. دایں خسرو خان بہر آؤیہ کساری دینداری و فیسی ویدر اصلی بود است۔ دایں چنان غلام کیم ویدر آؤیہ دالال الزمان از قوت بہر آؤیہ و نیندازن بہر تکت طبعی و طبی ہنست۔

Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 391-410.

'thoroughly un-Rajputlike'.¹

There is nothing in Barani or Amir Khusrau's work to show that Khusrau Khan and his brethren were out-caste or unclean or that they lacked the qualities of administration and fighting skill. Khusrau Khan, soon after Mubarak Khalji's accession became his Commander-in-Chief² and led successful campaigns in the south.³ The Sultan raised him to dignity and distinction higher than had ever been attained by Malik Naib Kafur.⁴

All the Persian chroniclers depict Khusrau Khan and his men as brave fighters. Amir Khusrau remarks, 'Barwaris are a fighting race among Hindus, who carry on the business of fighting and lay down their lives for the Hindu Rajs and Ranes.'⁵ Isami calls Khusrau Khan as a

1. Ishwari Prasad, History of the Qaraunah Turks in India, pp. 8-11, fn. 21.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 390.

3. Ibid., text, p. 391; Khusrau, Tugh. N., p. 18; Ibn Batuta, Travels, E. & D., Vol. III, pp. 605-06; Yahya, T.M.S., p. 85.

4. Barani, T.F.S., pp. 391-92.

5. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, p. 18.

برآورد وصف هندو پست سر باز - کہ ہم سر باز با شدیم سر انداز
 بو ہندو این دینہ دینہ راجاں - کہ جاں بازند سر فرماں رواجاں -

Hindu of Prao tribe, who lived in Gujarat.¹ Ibn Batuta also pays tribute to Khusrau Khan by writing of him as 'brave and handsome.'²

Khusrau Khan's assumption of sovereignty for a short period in A.H. 720/1320 A.D. after assassination of his benefactor (for which he has been severely condemned by Barani) was not altogether a new feature in the fourteenth century politics, for it had been practised at least possibly by Balban as well.

After becoming ruler, Khusrau Khan, who titled himself 'Nasirud-Din', scattered wealth like Alaud-Din to win the support of nobles and of a section of which he certainly secured. There are instances to show that Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq was not actually assisted by the Muqtis of Multan, Siwana, Samana and Jalor when he appealed to them to send forces in a bid to oust 'the usurper.'³ Khusrau, however, could not expect any support from the Hindu Rais

1. Ibid, text., p. 19. Barani also at one place called Barwaris, as 'Fidais' which testify Khusrau's description of Barwaris as brave fighters. (S.M.Haq, Barani's History of Tughluq, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi, p. 28, n. 3. See also Yahya, T.M.S., p. 91.

2. Isami, F.S., text, p. 372.

3. Isami, F.S., p. 62; Khusrau, Tugh. N., p. 48.

and Ranas, who refused to accept him as their over-lord under these circumstances.¹

Khusrau's failure lay perhaps more because of his unpopularity among the Turkish nobles and Hindu Rais and Ranas due to above reasons rather than his low origin.

The whole 'antagonism' of Barani was owing to the so-called 'revival of Hinduism' under Khusrau Khan,² and so also of the later writers, who ^h charged Khusrau of being half-Hindu, insulting Islam and promoting idol-worship in the place,³ which surely was a right denied to the filthy, low born, or polluted Shudra of the fourteenth century.

Khusrau Khan was in fact an Indian Muslim converted from a noble Hindu family, who by sheer dint of his power came to occupy the sovereignty of India. He seems to have belonged to an area somewhere on the border of Malwa and

1. S.B.P.Nigam, Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, p. 73.

2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 385. The chronicler further states that it brought a favourable period to the Hindus. Because of the low rate of Kharaj, the Hindus in general became prosperous, started wearing fine fabrics, riding horses and using bows and arrows etc. Ibid., text, p. 385-

3. Nizamud-Din, T.A., text, Vol. I, p. 93.

سوم خردن رونق در دین نما پیدا کرد. بت پستی و تنزیم ساجد نتایج شد.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 126.

Gujarat.¹

It was the term Barwar, Baradu, Parau, Parwar and Parwari, which became a victim to the Persian script and perhaps for this reason some later authorities described Hasan as a pahlwan (wrestler)² and darban (door-keeper).³ Neither of these two posts were necessarily lowly.

Khusrau Shah was able to seat himself on the throne of Delhi, though for a short period, through his personal bravery as well as the support and co-operation of a martial race of Hindu community which has been described as 'bravest and greatest'⁴ and which fought with greatest fury in defeating and pillaging Tughluq's camp.⁵

The real tribe or caste to which Khusrau belonged was left largely unexplored by many a modern writers,⁶ due to the obvious difficulties. One such has adopted a middle course and has ventured to identify Barwari, with Bharwar,

1. Isami, F.S., text, p. 372. In order to carry out his plans, he begged the permission of Mubarak Shah to call some of his connections from Bahlawal (بہاول) and the country of Gujarat. Barami, T.F.S., p. 402. The place has been identified by Hodivala as either Nahrwala or Bhinmal, the last of which place lies about 50 miles west of Abu and was ruled over by the Paramara Rajputs. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 288.

2. Ferishta, T.F., text, p. 126. ^{124.}

3. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 82.

4. Ibn Batuta, Travels, tr. E & D., Vol. III, p. 604.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 91.

6. See op.cit., Hodivala, K.S.Lal and Sri Ram Sharma.

which in Gujarati language means a shepherd¹ and who abound in Gujarat. But the innumerable references to their fighting skill and utmost bravery undoubtedly places Hasan and his men as belonging to a martial and organised tribe rather than to the community of shepherds.

The area of Malwa and eastern Gujarat, to which place Hasan and his men belonged, leads one to postulate their Paramara origin.

Paramara, misread as Parwar and Barwar 'p' and 'b' being often indistinguishable in Persian writing, is a well known Rajput tribe which established its hold over Malwa²

-
1. Jodnikosh of D.B.Kalekar, Published by Gujarat Vidyapeeth. Cited in A.L.Srivastava, I.H.Q., 1954, pp. 22-23.
 2. See also Mirat-i-Ahmadi, tr. James Bird, History of Gujarat, p. 167 and Bayley, Local Muhammadan Dynasties, p. 41, n. It has, however, been suggested that the Paramara origin of Khusrau Khan is not a sound theory. Firstly, Paramara, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in Persian script can never be read as Parwar and secondly had Khusrau Shah really been a Paramara, he would have been like the Sesodias, Rathors, Kachhwahas and the Chauhans etc., designated by a general term 'Rajput', with which the medieval Muslim writers were so intimately familiar. (I.H.Q., 1954, p. 21). Regarding the first objection it has been already stated that Khusrau and Isami etc., who wrote poetry were never careful about the term as such. The Barwar of Barsani and Badauni can be read as Parmar. Secondly the Persian writers of the 14th century were no doubt familiar with the terms Chauhans, Rathor and Kachhwaha etc., but not with the general term 'Rajput' which is not traceable in Barani, Isami or Ibn Batuta.

and Abu region, with Bhinmal as their capital in the early eleventh century.¹ After its sack by Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji in 1306, a number of local inhabitants were converted to Islam, which ultimately led to a class of Muslim Officers (centurions) who later on began to look upon these territories as their prized possessions. Perhaps Hasan and his men were members of good stock and of the above mentioned royal race.

*

1. See two Kiradu stone inscriptions of V.S. 1198 and V.S. 1218 respectively. I.A., Vol.LX I, p. 135. See also Pratipal Bhatia, The Paramaras, (Delhi, 1970), pp. 182-85.

CHAPTER * IX

. SULTAN GHIYASUD-DIN TUGHLUQ

With the death of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji, the throne of Delhi, under the weak and inefficient rules of Mubarak Khalji and Nasirud-Din Khusrau Khan, had lost much of its power and prestige, and was eventually occupied by Ghiyas-ud-Din,¹ the founder of Tughluq dynasty.

The rule of Tughluqs marked the climax of Muslim rule in India during the pre-Mughal period. Earlier, during the Khalji rule when he had served as the governor of Dipalpur, Ghiyasud-Din had already proved himself an

1. For a discussion regarding the name, origin and arrival of Tughluq and his predecessors in Delhi, see Khusrau, Tugh.N., text, p. 138; Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 416; Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 36; Ibn Batuta, Travells, tr., E. & D., Vol. III, p. 606; Muhammad Tughluq's alleged Autobiography, Alig. Rotograph, fl.1-2. See also Agha Mahdi Husain, Tughluq Dynasty, pp. 52-60; Ishwari Prasad, A History of the Qarammah Turks in India, pp. 1-55.

experienced commander in checking the Mongol raids,¹ as well as the Rajput chiefs.²

An interesting episode sheds light on the early relations between the Tughluq family and a Rajput clan. Afif tells us that during his governorship of Dipalpur, Tughluq desired to marry his brother Rajab to the daughter of Rana Mall Bhati of Abohar (in Fasilka Tehsil, district Ferozepur). The marriage proposal was, however, haughtily refused by the Bhati chieftain, at which Tughluq subjected the Mugaddams and the Chaudhuris of his region to hardship, by putting a demand of revenue payment in a lump sum. The Rana being put to extremity, married his daughter to Rajab. Rana's daughter which was later on known as Bibi Naila or Qad Banu, gave birth to the future Sultan Firuz Tughluq.³

-
1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 416; Khusrau, Tugh.N., text, p. 138. Ibn Batuta saw an inscription of Ghiyasud-Din at Multan which spoke of his 29 victories over the Mongols. Ibn Batuta's, Travells, tr. E. & D., Vol. III, p. 606.
 2. Khusrau refers to Ghiyasud-Din having rescued the Delhi forces during Sultan Jalalud-Din's unsuccessful invasion against Chauhans of Ranthambhor. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, pp. 136-38.
 3. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 37-39. Cf., Ferishta, (T.F., text, Vol. I, p. 130) and Sujau Rai Bhandari (Khulasat-ul-Tawarikh, text, pp. 245) both of whom assign Malik Tughluq's marriage in a local Jat family and the subsequent birth of Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq. This, however, needs corroboration. For earlier Muslim marriages with the local Rajputs, see Chach Nama, tr., pp. 146-47; Khusrau, Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, text, p. 197.

The early career of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din was spent in obscurity, till under the Khaljis, when he held the Iqta of Dipalpur,¹ which post he continued to hold till his accession to the throne of Delhi. He successfully led a revolution² against Khusrav Khan, the assassin of Sultan Mubarak Shah Khalji³ and himself ascended the throne in A.H. 720/1320 A.D.⁴

No details about Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq's hold over Rajasthan are available and it seems that Rajasthan formed an insignificant position during his reign, since all the energies of the Sultan were directed towards restoring his authority over the Deccan and Bengal.⁵

Rajasthan at the time of Ghiyasud-Din's accession, was still in a state of crumbled structure. The notable Rajput principalities like Chittor, Ranthambhor, Ja^clor,

-
1. Khusrav, Tugh.N., text, p. 51 ; Barani, T.F.S., text, p. — ; Arif, T.Ex.Sh., text, p. 36.
 2. Barani, T.F.S., text., pp. 402-408; Khusrav, Tugh. N., text, pp. 54-55; Ibn Batuta, Travells, tr., E. & D., Vol. III, pp. 607-08.
 3. For details, see Supra, Chapter VIII, The Barwars, pp. 219-227.
 4. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 425; Isami, E.S., text, p. 338; Yahya, (T.M.S., text, p. 193) gives the date of 1st Shaban, A.H. 721/26th August, 1321 A.D. which obviously is wrng. Coins of Ghiyasud-Din bearing the date A.H. 720/1320 A.D. are extant.
 5. Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 446-50; Yahya, T.M.S., text, pp. 83-95; Ibn Batuta, travells, tr. E. & D., Vol. III, pp. 608-09.

Sivana, and Jaisalmer had been thoroughly sacked and subjugated during the rule of the imperial Khaljis.¹ Although no fresh conquest of any part of Rajasthan was undertaken by the newly established Sultan, it seems that apart from Ajmer and Nagaur, the chauhan principality of Ranthambhor, Sivana, Jalor and the Guhila territory of Mewar remained under Ghiyasud-Din by virtue of the previous conquests.

We do not know any thing about the fresh appointments in Rajasthan, but it seems that the principalities of Ajmer, Jalor and Chittor were governed by the Muslim governors.

The Iqta of Ajmer, during Ghiyasud-Din's reign was under Muhammad Shah.² According to Tughluq Nama, the Muqti of Jalor named Hoshang, son of Amir Kamalud-Din Gurg, was sent a letter by Ghazi Malik seeking his help in his war against Khusrau Shah.

A fragmentary inscription of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq's reign found in Chittor⁴ records that Asadud-Din

1. See Supra, Chapter VI, Khalji Imperialism, pp. 145-206.

2. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, p. 64.

3. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, p. 57

دگر برقطه جاویر پوشند که مانند پیر در گزیت راجگ

It is, however, not known, if the Muqti of Jalor actually came to the assistance of Ghazi Tughluq.

4. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 67-68.

خدا شملت سیدان و تاج دینی ... سیدین عصر تنقش شاه ... سید اسحاق بن ارسلان ...

Arslan (cousin brother of Muhammad Tughluq) was the builder of some construction, the nature of which is not known. It, however, seems probable that Chittor was not lost to the newly established dynasty at Delhi. It becomes almost evident from another Persian inscription of Muhammad Tughluq's reign, found from 'Ghaibi Pir' Mosque at Chittor,¹ that Asadud-Din, who had been appointed as Naib Barbak² by Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq, held Chittor at least up to the accession of Muhammad Tughluq.³

The record though fragmentary is interesting since it is one of the few surviving Muslim inscriptions found at Chittor. Malik Asadud-Din is apparently the nephew of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din. These two inscriptions are at present the only known pieces of evidence regarding the control of the Tughluq Sultans over the important state of Chittor.

On the basis of the above inscription it has been contented that Mewar remained under Sultan Ghiyasud-Din with Maladeva and his son and successor Jaisa or Jai Singh as the governors.⁴ The latter succeeded his father in 1321.

1. Noticed by G.H.Ojha, A.R.R.M., 1921-22, p. 2. For text and tr. see E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 68-69.
2. An officer incharge of the entire court administration and the other officials.
3. Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 68-69.
4. I.H.Q., 1951, p. 68; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp.

Banbir, another son of Maladeva, is also recorded in an inscription dated 23rd September 1335,¹ to have possessed Chittor for some years. It, therefore, seems probable that Hammira, the Sesodia claimant to Mewar principality must have recovered the ancestral territory from Banbir.

A Sanskrit inscription from Ladnu (Jodhpur) dated Bhadra Vadi 3, Sukra dine V.S. 1373²/Friday, 6th August, 1316 A.D., gives the geneology of the Sultans of Delhi from Muhammad of Ghor to Alaud-Din Khalji. The second part of the record states that its consecration (pratishtha) rites were performed on the second date during the reign of Kutvadhina (Qutbud-Din Mubarak Khalji) but was engraved when Ghyasadina (Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq) was the emperor. This might indicate the Ghiyasud-Din inherited the territory of Nagaur and Jodhpur from the Khaljis.

The region around Mt. Abu during Ghiyasud-Din's reign was held by Lundha of the Deora line of Chauhans. This is evident from an inscription dated 6th April, 1321.³

1. "संवत् 1392 चैत्र शुक्ल ८ तमे तिथि रविवार संवत् 1392 महेन्द्राष्टमि
पृथ्वीराज चौहानदेव द्वारा श्री अजमेर मंदिर
P.C.Nahar, J.L.S., Vol. II, p. 242.

2. Bhandarkar, P.R. (W.C.), 1906-07, p. 31; For text, see Pt. Ram Karan, E.I., Vol. XII, pp. 2-3.

3. Noticed by Kalhorn, E.I., Vol. IX, p. 79; For text, see Wilson, Archaeological Researches, Vol. XVI, p. 285. The inscription records certain repairs by Luntiga of Achleshwara temple, and granting a village.

The principality seems to have been once held by Chaulukyas. The Chauhanas acted as their feudatories. Vijada, son of Pratapmalla, is described as the lord of 'Marumandala,'¹ and is also said to have conquered 'Arbuda' and become the master of the territory of the Solankis (Chaulukyas). The government of 'Arbuda' and the adjoining territories was carried on by the scions of Vijada in V.S. 1378/1322 A.D.²

The region from Mt. Abu up to Cambay in the extreme western region, thus remained under central control during Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq's reign. Gujarat was an important province under the Tughluqs. Malik Tajud-Din Zafar acted as the Wali of Gujarat.³ This is further supported by a bilingual inscription from Petlad (Cambay). The Sanskrit part dated V.S. 1380/1323 A.D.⁴ refers to Sultan Ghiyasud-Din and his appointment of a Dewan at Anahilpattana, a Mandala or a district. The inscription is inscribed in the tomb of Pir Arjun Shah at Petlad.

1. "श्रीराजस्य मरुमण्डलम् .." /
E.I., Vol. IX, p. 155.

2. Ibid. He probably laid the foundation of the Deora kingdom of Abu, first as a captain of Chachiga's forces and later by making new conquests on his own account. Dashratha Sharma, E.C.D., p. 174, fn. 7.

3. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 428.

4. P.R. (W.C.), 1918-19, p. 46.

There is a reference to some invasion in Gujarat by Isami,¹ Sometime after the Mongol invasion. The Sultan sent Shadi Dadar,² his Naib towards Gujarat. The campaign however, according to the same chronicler miserably failed.³

The condition of Gujarat and some other regions of western India, after their sack by Alaud-Din, remained deplorable for several years. According to Jain account Kartaragachchhapattavali, the country was in a grip of severe famine in V.S. 1377/1320 A.D.⁴

Although Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq inherited a shaky and economically poor empire, his measures towards army organization⁵ attempt to solve the unemployment problem⁶ and general reforms,⁷ seem to have given a peaceful rule

1. Isami, F.S., text, pp. 409-10.
2. For his name see also the list of officials of Sultan Ghiyasud-Din Tughluq, see Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 423.
3. Isami states that when the Hindus were hardpressed, a group of the Parawaris among them sent Shadi Khan a message that they were dancers and could entertain him if set free. The soldiers in disguise of the dancers came to the tent of Shadi Khan and murdered the latter, at which the Muslim forces made their escape to the capital. (Isami, F.S., text, pp.). Barani does not refer to this event.
4. Khartaragachchhapattavali, text, p. 69.
5. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 438. "...
6. Ibid., p. 436.
7. Ibid., pp. 435-36.

... एतद् युवा... नृपतिं प्रीति -
- प्रयत्नं कृतं 5/6. "

to his subjects, both Hindus and Muslims. Barani makes several remarks regarding the Sultan's treatment of Hindu officials of his empire. He is told to have instructed the Muqtis and Walis to treat the Hindus in such a way that they may not become rebellious due to accumulation of money. They should also not be put to such an extremity that they may abandon agriculture.¹ The Muqtis and Wallis were further instructed to see that the Khuts and Mugaddams should not collect anything beyond usual payment of kharaj.²

Several references to the recruitment of Rajput Rawats, Rais and Ranas in the army,³ and the Chaudhuris. Khuts and Mugaddams in the revenue department,⁴ by Ghiyasud-Din as well as his predecessors show that a congenial atmosphere had been created in the fourteenth century by the ruling Sultans, who have also been reported to have kept all their subjects, Hindus and Muslims at par in matters of appointments and general uplift of the peasantry.

The religious tolerance of the Sultan towards Hindus in general and Jains of Gujarat and Rajasthan in particular is attested by a contemporary chronicle, Khartaragachchha Pattavali. According to this Jain account, one of the

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 43.

2. Ibid.

3. Khusrau, Tugh. N., text, p. 93, 108.

4. Barani, T.F.S., p. 430.

disciples of Jain Kushala Suri, (V.S. 1377-1389), named Rayapati, secured a firman from Sultan Ghiyasud-Din for a holy pilgrimage in the year of the accession of the Sultan.¹

The same chronicle tells us that the Sangha was escorted by the Muslim troopers and now and then, with the use of the state band.² An year before his death (V.S. 1381/1323 A.D.) the Sultan through another firman permitted the Jain monks to start a pilgrimage from Bhimapalli.³

According to another Jain source, Naina and his son Dusaju, had held important positions under Sultan Jalalud-Din and Alaud-Din Khalji and continued to enjoy the same position under Ghiyasud-Din as well.⁴

Samar Singh Jain, a close friend of Alap Khan, the Khalji governor of Gujarat, repaired the famous Satrunjay temple of Palitana with permission of Sultan Alaud-Din in 1318. He was also invited by Sultan Qutbud-Din at Delhi.

1. Khartaragachohhapattavali, text, p. 72.

2. Ibid. "પાત્ર મારીને એ સંપત્તિથી મહેલો, રાજાઓ, યુરોપીયો..."

See also I.H.Q., 1950, p. 230.

3. Khartaragachohhapattavali, text, p. 73.;
I.H.Q., 1950, p. 230.

4. Suri, Vividhatirthakalpa, pp. 1-2; Mahdi Husain, Tughluq Dynasty, p. 315. See also Proceedings of Oriental Congress, Baroda, 1933, pp. 629-33 and I.H.Q., 1941, p. 301.

Sultan Ghiyasud-Din sent him to Telingana, where he built many temples.¹

There is also reference to Dharma Simha, who had great influence at the Sultan's court and was specially befriended by his chief minister, whose name is given in the Khartaragachchhapattavali, as Sri Neb.² During the same period Jainadatta Suri, the chief Jain monk, enjoyed great prestige among Muslims.

●●●●●
●●●
●

1. Vividhatirthakalpa, pp. 1-2;
I.H.Q., 1941, p. 301.

2. Probably Najib, meaning a Vazir. "نایب وزیر، علی گڑھ راجہ ایلیا"

Khartaragachchhapattavali, text, p. 72.

CHAPTER * XI

SULTAN FIRUZ TUGHLUQ

Firuz Tughluq who peacefully ascended the throne in 1351¹, inherited a shaky empire. The Sultanate of Delhi had once extended from Panjab to Mabbar in the South, Lakhnauti in the east and Gujarat and Sind in the West. However, at the time of Firuz's accession, it had contracted to Northern India, with Bengal and Sind also independent. But the Sultan's control over most of Rajasthan seems to have been maintained atleast in the early part of his reign.

Sultan firuz Tughluq as mentioned elsewhere, was born of a Rajput mother of the Bhati tribe.² It seems that some Rajputs of his mother's tribe were at the court. We are told about the presence of one of the Sultan's maternal uncles Rai Bhiru Bhati, who helped the Sultan³

1. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 529 and Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 36 give the date as 24th Muharram A.H. 752/23rd March 1351 A.D.

2. Supra, p. 229.

3. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 103-04. The Sultan asked 'Rai Bhiru give me the sword, thou hast in thy hand.' The Rai perceived the excitement of the Sultan and replied, 'I will draw my sword and follow your Majesty. You may proceed home.' However, without heeding the Rai, the Sultan snatched sword and reached safely to his place.

when Khudawandzada plotted to kill him.¹

Sultan Firuz Tughluq is not told to have led any expedition into Rajasthan during his rule. However, once the Sultan proceeded towards Deccan, to recover the territory from the Brahmans, but seeing the march very difficult and the recovery of Daultabad a futile attempt, he abandoned the project and returned from Bayana.²

During his retreat from Thatta expedition,³ Sultan was misguided and instead of reaching back to Gujarat, most of his army perished in the Run of Cutch. The new guides were appointed only to add to their misery and the royal troops which had hardly escaped from Cutch, fell into the desert.

The dread desert, aggravated the misery of the troops and most of the horses fell from exhaustion and the soldiers had to proceed on foot. At last the rains came and the soldiers quenched their thirst with the rainy water. The same day a route to Gujarat was discovered and after

1. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 100-104.

2. Ibid., p. 185. The Muqti of Bayana during Firuz Tughluq's reign was Malik Muinud-Din. Tarikh-i-Muhammadi, tr., S.A.A. Rizvi, Tughluq Kaleen Bharat (Hindi), Vol. II, p. 227.

3. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 206, 217-219.

six months wandering the forces escaped to the territory of Gujarat.¹ The governor of Gujarat, Nizam-ul-Mulk was suspended for his failure to send supplies and the reinforcements and Zafar Khan was appointed in his place.²

Persian inscriptions corresponding to the reign of Firuz Tughluq have been found from Bharatpur and Amber territories. One of the Persian inscriptions found from Kaman fort in Bharatpur refers only to the date, which is given as A.H. 754/1353 A.D.³ The 'Chausath Khamba' Mosque on which the date is inscribed, seems to have been built out of Hindu temple materials, since its pillars contain several letters in Devanagari characters.⁴

Two Persian inscriptions from Etanada in the same district, record the death of Shaikh Masud Isa Afghan on 1st Shawwal, A.H. 783/19th December, 1381 A.D.⁵ This might refer to Afghan settlements in Rajasthan during Tughluq period.

1. Afif, T.F.R.Sh., text, pp. 207-219.

2. Ibid., pp. 219-220.

3. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 57.

4. Ibid.

5. G.Yazdani, E.I.A.P.S., 1953-54, pp. 14, 17.
For another inscription of Masud (Isa), see
Ibid., p. 16, line 26.

وفات شیخ مسعود عیسی افغان ... بتاریخ غره شوال سنہ ثلث و ثمانین و سببایہ

An important bilingual inscription dated 1st Rabi A.H. 768/6th October-December 1363 A.D.¹ found at Sambhar (Jaipur) refers to the construction of a step-well during the reign of Sultan Firuz Shah during the 'governorship of Malik Kamalud-Din Daulat Khuram ... through the efforts of the follower of Islam, Basu Deva, son of Nathu son of Ganga Deva ...'.²

The ten lines of the above Persian inscription are followed by its Sanskrit version and the date is given as Margashirsha Vadi 14, V.S. 1420 and Saka 1286, corresponding to 6th October 1363 A.D. Malik Kamalud-Din Ahmad is mentioned in the inscription as the governor of the Sambhar region. However, since no Persian chronicle refers to Kamalud-Din as enjoying the status of a governor it is difficult to identify him with his name sake referred to by Afif, Ferishta or Badauni.³

1. G.Yazdani, E.I.A.P.S., 1956-57, pp. 57-58.

2. Ibid.; Y.K.Bukhari, E.I.A.P.S., 1957-58, p. 57.;
The Persian version is followed by a Sanskrit
3. version.

3. Afif, (T.F.Sh., p. 339) refers to one Kamalud-Din with the suffix of Turti Khan as incharge of a factory. Ferishta (T.F., text, p. 144) refers Kamalud-Din as a theologian during Firuz Shah's reign. According to Badauni he was one of the nobles who participated in the conspiracy to poison Firuz's mind against prince Muhammad. Another Kamalud-Din is also referred to in the above revolt. Badauni, M.T., text, pp. 113, 142.

سک مال الدین تور تینخان کفر جانداد خانہ داشت

The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* mentions one Hindu named Sadharan who embraced Islam and received the title of 'Wajih-ul-Mulk' from Sultan Firuz Shah. His son Zafar Khan was appointed Governor of Gujarat by Firuz, and he was the founder of the Gujarat kingdom.¹ The same work also mentions the name of Shams Khan as the brother of the Wajih-ul-Mulk.² This Shams Khan is stated in a latter inscription from Naraina, (Jaipur) to have conquered the towns of Didwana, Sambhar, and Naraina and to have built forts and mosques³ etc.

Sanskrit inscriptions referring to the rule of Sultan Firuz Tughluq have been found in Alwar, Chittor and Sanchor (Marwar) regions.

The first of this series, found from Dhigwara (Alwar) dated V.S. 142/1364 A.D.⁴ records the repair of a Baoli by Amreshwara son of Goga Deva during the reign of 'Peroja Sahi.' (Sultan Firuz Tughluq). The second inscription from Macheri, in the same district is dated V.S. 1439/1382 A.D. and records the name of Maharana Goga Deva, son of Asala Deva of Bada Gujara family, during the reign of Sultan

1. *Mirat-i-Sikandari*, text, p.3(4); tr. E.C.Bayley, *History of Gujarat*, pp. 67-69; According to this chronicle, the two brothers, who belonged to a town near Thanesar, married their sister to the Sultan and the family consequently embraced Islam. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-70.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 93, fn.

3. G.Yadani, *E.I.M.*, 1923-24, p. 16.

4. Bhandarkar's, *List*, p. 100; G.H.Ojha, *A.R.R.M.*, 1918-19, p. 2.

Firuz Shah.¹

Although there are several inscriptions of later dates² indirectly referring to the Muslims apart from their geneologies, it is very difficult to say whether the Sesodias acknowledged the central authority.

To revert to the History of the Sesodia princes of Mewar, we have already discussed the traditional account of Hammira. The prince, who is said to have ruled for about 64 years might have died in 1378, if we suppose his reign to have begun from 1313-1314. But in view of an inscription referring to Khshetra Simha as ruling in 1366 as well as traditional accounts which place Hammira's death in 1364,³ it is better to accept the traditional date of his death.

Firuz Tughluq's indifference towards the political changes in the western parts of his empire, led not only to the independence of Malwa and Gujarat, but even gave a free hand to Khshetra Simha, who followed the foot-steps of his father and further strengthened his position.

The Chittor inscription of V.S. 1485/1428 A.D.⁴ mentioned above, further records that Khshetra Simha invaded

1. A.R.R.M., 1918-19, p. 2; I.A., Vol. XIX, p. 31; Bhandarkar's List, p. 102.

2. R.C.Majumdar, (ed.), Delhi Sultanate, Vol. VI, p. 329.

3. See Ekalinga inscription dated V.S. 1485/1428 A.D. and Ranakpur inscription dated V.S. 1496/1440 A.D. Supra, p. 209 and 243, fn. 2; E.I., Vol. II, pp. 408-21; Bhandarkar's List, pp. 106-07.

4. Supra, p. 209, fn. 2.

Bundi then in possession of the Hadas,¹ and captured the fort of Mandalgarh, thus making the Hada Chauhans his feudatories.²

Apart from this a number of other inscriptions refer to his successful operations against the Rajput chiefs of Idar and the Muslim rulers of Malwa and Gujarat. Hammira, as noticed earlier, asserted his overlordship on Jaitra Karna of Idar.³ Jaitra Karna's son and successor Ranamalla, came into conflict with Gujarat ruler Muzaffar Khan and was possibly successful. He, however, was overpowered by Khshetra Simha and Idar once more acknowledged Mewar supremacy, as is boastfully recorded in a later inscription.⁴

1. Deva Simha Hada, according to Nainsi, married his daughter to Hammira's father Arisimha and with latter's help captured Bundi from the Minas. Nainsi, N.K., text, Vol. I, pp. 98-99. For the early history of the Hadas Chauhans of Bundi, see Supra, pp. 207-212.

2. Ekalingji Inscription of V.S. 1485/1428 A.D. verse 16, Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, p. 106. It seems that the Hadas recovered Bundi sometimes during the sack of Chittor and this must have necessitated Khshetra Simha to recover it.

B.I., p. 11; Bhandarkar's List, No. 765. See also Supra, p. 209, fn. 2.

3. Supra, p. 244, fn. 1.

4. Kumbhalgarh inscription of V.S. 1517/1460 A.D.; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 411-12.

Khshetra Simha with the help of his Hada feudatory Mahadeva,¹ is said to have won a battle against Ami Shah,² the ruler of Malwa, when the latter possibly invaded Sesdia territory. Ami Shah (alias Dilawar Khan Ghauri) however, came to the throne of Malwa in the beginning of the fifteenth century and the victory is claimed over in 1389. The conflict, therefore, must have taken place much earlier when Dilawar Khan was a relatively minor official in Malwa just at the end of Firuz Tughluqs' reign.³

1. The free translation of the relevant passage runs as under: 'The sword grasped in his (Mahadeva's) hands dazzled the eye of his enemy, as when lifted under the head of Ami Shah. He rescued the lord of 'Medapat' and dragged Kaita from his grasp as is Chandra from the Rahu. He (Mahadeva) trode the Sultan's army under foot as does the ox the corn, even as did the Danavas (demons) churn the ocean, so did Mahadeva the field of strife, seizing the gem of victory from the son of the king, and bestowing on Kaita, the lord of men.' See inscription from Menal, dated V.S. 1446/1389 A.D., Tod, Annals, Vol. III, pp. 1803.
2. Ami Shah or Amid Shah Daud, was the title born by Dilawar Khan Ghuri, who founded the independent Sultanate of Malwa in A.H. 804/1401-02 A.D. E.I.M. 1909-10, pp. 11-12. See also inscription from Chittor, dated V.S. 1517, which records:
 "अमलसिंह महाराज ने कछुआ मर्दाना राजा को पराजित करके
 Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 412, verse 201.
3. Riskullah, Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi, (Alig. Roto), p. 259 ; U.N.Dey, (Medieval Malwa, pp. 14, fn. 3) surmises the victory to be a boastful claim by the Rajputs over Ami Shah, who he says, was not occupying any post of consequence. However, the inscription puts the date of the conflict in V.S. 1446/1389 A.D. and references to Ami Shah and Khshetra Simha suggest the possibility of a conflict. See also G.N.Sharma, Mewar and the Mughals, p. 9.

Mewar under Khshetra Sinha, thus seems to have taken a lead over the neighbouring Rajput and Muslim states. The prince, according to Rana Kumbha's commentary, died a centenarian.¹

Kyam Khan Raso² and Nainsi Khyat³ refer to the rise of the Kyam Khani Chauhans over the region now called Shekhawati. Although the versions of the Raso and Khyat differ in the story leading to the conversion, it is probable that the Chauhans of the region (which includes the present districts of Jhunjhnu and Churu) were converted to Islam during the period of Sultan Firuz Tughluq.⁴

After tracking the geneology of the early Chauhan rulers, the Raso refers to the rule of Tihunpala and his

1. Int. to Rasikpriya, a commentary on the Gita Govinda, Vol. II, verse 7 (cited in R.C.Majumdar, (ed.), Delhi Sultanate, Vol. VI, p. 426, fn. 10).
2. Kyam Khan Raso was written in 1624. (text, published by Rajasthan Puratatva Mandir, Jaipur, V.S. 2010), p. 11.
3. Nainsi, N.K., text, Vol. III, p. 273-74.
4. The date of Karmohand alias Kyam Khan's conversion is given as V.S. 1440/1383 A.D. (Kyam Khan Raso, Int. p. 16, fn. 1). Yahya puts the date of his death in 20th Jamadi-ul Awwal, A.H. 822/1419 A.D. (T.M.S., text, p. 189). Fateh Khan, the grandson of Kyam Khan is again told to have founded Fatehpur in V.S. 1508/1441 A.D. Kyam Khan Raso, Appdx., IV, p. 45.

" ५६२ ८४३ ३३ ३१८०२ ८८४ ५८६५२ ५८४
Ibid., text, p. 32. ३६ ५८५ १६५ ६८८६ ३३ ५८६५२ ५८४ "

son Mota Rai at Dadreva.¹ It was Mota Rai's son Karmchand who was converted to Islam by Sultan Firuz and re-named Qayam Khan or Kyan Khan.²

Kyan Khan is told to have been brought up and favoured by the Sultan. The Raso further mentions that the Sultan entitled him 'Khan-i-Jahan' and appointed him Faujdar and incharge of Delhi when he left for Thatta.³ The chronology of the period, however, makes it difficult to believe the above version of the Raso. The Thatta campaign commenced in 1361 A.D.⁴, and continued for two years.⁵

1. Kyan Khan Raso, text, p. 11.

ਪਿਤੁ ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ ਸੁਨ ਤੁਧੁ ਭਾਇ, ਮੋਟੇ ਰਹਿ ਲਕਾਤਾ ।
ਨਿਮ ਕਾਮੁਰ ਸੁਰਸੇ ਕੀਯੋ, ਦੇਵੇ ਰੋਗੇ ਮੇਂ ਰਾਤਾ ॥ "

that the Chauhans held Dadreva since 13th century is supported by an inscription dated V.S. 1270. Tessitori, J.A.S.B., Vol. XVI, p. 257. Nainsi also mentions about the Chauhan rule over Dadreva. Nainsi, N.K., text, Vol. III, p. 273.

2. Kyan Khan Raso, text, p. 11-12.

ਨਾਨਕ ਤੁਧੁ ਭਾਇ, ਜਰਮੇ ਚੰਦ ਪਰਤ ਕਥਾ, ਮੇਰੇ ਰੋਗੇ ।
ਤੁਰਕ ਕਰਕੇ ਧਰਮ ਲਾਹਾ ਧਰਕੇ ਕਾਮੁਰ ਰਾਇ ॥ "

Nainsi wrongly puts the event during the reign of Sultan Bahlul Lodi, Nainsi, N.K., Vol. III, p. 273.

3. Kyan Khan Raso, text, p. 14. ਮੋਤੀ ਰਾਇ ਕਰੇ ਰਾਇ ਕਰੇ ਮੇਂ ਧੀ
ਫਿਰੋਜ਼ ਸ਼ਾਹੀ, ਮੁਗ਼ਲ ਸਾਮਰਾਜ ਸਾਹਿਬ, ਧਰਮੇ 821 ਆਂ ਮਾਹਿ ॥ "

4. Sirat-i-Firuzshahi, (A.M.U. Mss. 68) states that Firuz returned from Jajnagar expedition in A.H. 762/1361 A.D. and shortly after this he invited Nagarkot and little later Sind. Another possible date of the expedition has been given as 1365. R.C. Jauhari, Feroz Tughluq, (Agra, 1968), p. 111, fn.

5. Ibid., p. 85.

while the Kyan Khan's conversion to Islam is given in the year 1383. Since Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi put the death of Kyan Khan in 1419, it is impossible to agree with the Raso's version of Kyan Khan's presence at the Sultan's court during the Thatta campaign.¹ Similarly the title of 'Khan-i-Jahan' was conferred on Malik Maqbul and not on Kyan Khan.²

There is possibly here a confusion between Qayan Khan and Khan-i-Jahan Maqbul, who was a convert from Telingana.

The Tarikh-Muhammadi states that soon after curbing the rebellion of Etawah (1378) the Sultan despatched Malik Zada Firuz to invade Malwa. The Commander reached a place named Kalrun ("کالردن" ? probably "کالردن" Qagrun), the famous fortress) near Malwa and surrounded the fortress. The fortress, however, could not be conquered and after accepting nominal tribute and entering into a treaty, he returned safely to the capital.³ The information supplied by the chronicle, however, is not confirmed by any other authority.

-
1. Likewise the defeat of Mongols at the hands of Kyan Khan seems to be a fabrication. Kyan Khan Raso, p. 111, fn. 1.
 2. Barani, T.F.S., text, p. 544; Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 395. Malik Maqbul was also converted to Islam during Muhammad Tughluq's reign and acted as Naib Vazir of Delhi. Tarikh-i-Muhammadi, text, p.
 3. Ibid.

In the last years of his reign, Firuz Tughluq witnessed a series of disturbances caused by the slaves - an institution of his own making. The Firuz Shahi slaves played a major role as 'king makers.' The Vazir Khan-i-Jahan who took all the affairs of the state into his own hands, poisoned the Sultan's ears against prince Muhammad Khan and imprisoned Darya Khan, son of Amir of Mahoba in his residence. The prince invaded the place in Rajab, A.H. 789/July-August, 1387 A.D. Khan-i-Jahan, unable to resist the prince, fled towards Mewat and took shelter with Koka Chauhan, the chief of Macheri,¹ near Alwar.

The prince immediately deputed Malik Yaqoob Sikandar Khan to proceed towards Macheri. The Chauhan chief when hard pressed by the royal forces, killed Khan-i-Jahan and delivered his head to the royal court.²

The rule of Sultan Firuz Tughluq which was comparatively a period of general welfare and the prosperity of the subjects, however, had certain draw-backs. A number of instances of his temple destruction, forcible conversions, persecution of the Hindus, and imposition of Jasiah on the Brahmans, have been mentioned in contemporary and later chronicles.

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 137-38.

... بیان سیوات شده در محاذی بر کوکا چوگان رفت و از پناگریخت

2. Ibid.

The Sultan is reported to have considered the idol-worshippers of Jawalamukhi temple as fools.¹ He demolished the famous temple of Jagannathpuri in Orissa,² the idol-temples at the villages of Maluha, Tughluqpur, Salhipur, (near Delhi) Gohana³ and Etawah.⁴

The Sultan wrote in his *Fatuhāt* :... their books of infidelity, idols and other paraphernalia of idolworship, which had been brought with them were ordered to be burnt in public at the place of execution...'.⁵

Although there are no instances of forcible conversions carried on by the Sultan, it appears from the Statement of *Sirat-i-Ferozshahi*⁶ that the Sultan encouraged some conversions. The conversion of Kyan Khan alias Karnchand has

1. Afif, *T.Fr.Sh.*, text, p. 187.

2. *Ibid.*, text, p. 169; Badauni, *M.T.*, text, p. 233.

3. *Fatuhāt-i-Ferozshahi*, text, pp. 11-12.

The names of the places given in the text are:

” توضیح بلوہ - تھلق پور - سالہ پور - صالح پور - گوانہ ”

4. *Tarikh-i-Muhammadi*, Mss., fl. 41(a) and 412 (b).
tr. S.A.A.Rizvi, *Tughluq Kaleen Bharat*, Vol. II,
p. 224 and *Insha-i-Mahru*, *Ibid.*, p. 381, Appdx.B.

5. *Fatuhāt-i-Ferozshahi*, text, pp. 11-12. Afif mentions an eye witness account of the execution of a Brahman for advocating idol-worshipping. Afif, *T.Fr.Sh.*, text, pp. 381-82. See also *Insha-i-Mahru*, tr., S.A.A.Rizvi, *Tughluq Kaleen Bharat*, p. 382, Appdx. B.

6. *Sirat-i-Ferozshahi*, *Alg. Ms.* p. 170.

already been mentioned.¹

The Jaziah was imposed on the Brahmans for the first time and was lowered to the rate of third category² only on the strong protest by the community.³

Apart from severe capital punishments for idol-worshipping, the Sultan ruthlessly massacred the inhabitants of Katehar (Rohilkhand) in A.H. 782/1380-81 A.D. for the fault of their chief Kharku (Kharg Singh), who had assassinated the governor of Budaun along with his two brothers.⁴ The Sultan is mentioned as having made an invasion to that principality an annual feature.⁵

As against this, it is difficult to ignore that the Hindus and the Rajput peasant in general were happy and content. This is borne out by the testimony of the

1. Kyam Khan Raso, text, pp. 11-12.

2. The three categories of Jaziah prevalent at that time was (a) 40 Tankas, (b) 20 Tankas and (c) 10 Tankas. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 383. A modern writer defending the imposition of Jaziah, writes that the measure was based on the equity of the theory of taxation and also to add to the state revenue. J.M.Bannerjee, History of Feroz Tughluq (Delhi, 1967), pp. 123-25 and 170.

3. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 382-84.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 135; Badauni, M.I., text, p. 235; Ferishta, T.F., tr., Briggs, Vol. I, p. 457.

5. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 180; Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 135; Badauni, M.I., text, p. 235.

contemporary chronicler Afif.¹ Rai Bhiru, a Bhati Rajput, already mentioned, acted probably as a body guard to the Sultan.² Rai Ziara, a Hindu Zamindar is also said to have helped the Sultan during the latter's expedition towards Bengal.³ There is also reference to the presence of Rai Madar (Balar) Deo, Rai Sabir and Rawdat (Rawat) Adharan at the court of Sultan.

This might indicate that the Sultan became 'a victim of the circumstances' and 'lowered to the imperious demands of the time', but he certainly had no intention to follow a 'systematic and sustained' policy of religious intolerance as has been inferred by some of the modern writers.⁵

The fortunes of the Tughluq Empire, already in no happy circumstances, at the end of Firuz Tughluq's reign and during the years following his death, were given a decisive blow by the invasion of Amir Timur in 1398.

Amir Timur left a general disorder, epidemic and severe famine in the places through which he passed. The

1. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, pp. 99-100.
2. Supra, p. 282, fn. 3.
3. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 11; Barani, T.F.S., text, pp. 587-88.
4. Afif, T.Fr.Sh., text, p. 281.
5. R.C.Jauhari, Feroz Tughluq (Delhi, 1967), p. 149.

situation, as recorded by the contemporary chronicle, remained critical at least for two months after his departure.¹

Sultan Nusrat Shah, the grandson of Sultan Firuz Tughluq, who, due to the treachery of Iqbal Khan had fled towards Doab, managed to capture Delhi in Rajab, A.H. 801/March-April, 1399 A.D. Soon Malik Shihab Khan, the governor of Mewat along with some other Maliks assembled around him.² Nusrat Shah, however, was soon overpowered by Iqbal and fled towards Mewat, where subsequently he died.³

Iqbal Khan against Bayana:

Iqbal Khan invaded Bayana in A.H. 802/1399 A.D. and defeated Shams Khan near the towns of Nuh and Batal.⁴ Shams Khan fled to his Iqta and Iqbal returned after acquiring two elephants as tribute.⁵

Iqbal was defeated and assassinated by Khizr Khan, the governor of Lahore and Dipalpur and the Amirs invited Nasirud-Din Mahaud to the throne in Jamadi-ul-Akhir, A.H. 808/November-December 1405 A.D.⁶ The affairs of Delhi

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 167.

2. Ibid.; Ahmad, T.A., text, Vol. I, p. 256.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 168;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 257.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 169.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 175; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 260.

henceforth were dominated over by Saiyyid Khizr Khan, and it would be safe to cover the details of subsequent events under the history of Saiyyid dynasty founded by Khizr Khan.

*

CHAPTER * XIITHE SAIYYIDS AND MEWAT

All authority of the Tughluq Sultans over large parts of Rajasthan, seems to have disappeared, with the death of Firuz and the invasion of Timur. Henceforth the ambitions of the Delhi authorities appear to have become confined to recovering or maintaining control over Mewat and Bayana in eastern Rajasthan, besides the important town of Nagaur in Central Rajasthan.

It has already been mentioned that the region of Mewat which included the modern Rajasthan districts of Alwar and Bharatpur, apart from Mathura and Gurgaon, remained a source of constant trouble and centre of seditious activities till Balban's reign.¹

As a result of Balban's stern measures against the region, the Khalji period witnessed some pause from the Mewati disturbances. The silence about Mewat continued even after the period of Alaud-Din Khalji, perhaps due to the drastic action of the Sultan against rebels like the Jalali nobles and the 'Neo Mussalmans'.²

1. Supra, pp. 120-121 and 130-131.

2. B.S.Mathur, 'Mewat Affairs during Sultanate period', J.I.H., Vol. XLV, part 11, August 1967, p. 513.

Under Sultan Firuz Tughluq, a considerable section of the Hindu population of the northern parts of Mewat was converted to Islam. This is known from the traditional records of the family histories and the tradition of the Khanzadas of Mewat.¹ However, the reference to Koka Chauhan ruling at Macheri (about 25 miles from Alwar) certainly suggests that parts of the region remained under the Rajputs.²

It goes beyond doubt that the Yaduvansi Rajputs, who were the original occupants of the principality of Bayana, accepted Islam under their leader Bahadur Nahir,³ who became the leader of the Khanzadas.⁴

During Timur's invasion, Bahadur Nahir watched the political developments quietly. He gave shelter to a number of Delhi fugitives including the future ruler Saiyyid Khizr Khan.⁵ There is also a reference of Timur's sending an envoy to Bahadur Nahir⁶ which perhaps gave an advantageous

1. J.I.H., Vol. XLV, part II, p. 518.; K.B.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 58, fn. 83.

2. Supra, p. 263, fn. 1.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 138; Badauni, M.T., p. 254; Hodivala, Studies in Indo Muslim History, p. 390; J.I.H., Vol. XXXVIII, 1960.

4. For a detailed notice of the Khansada chiefs of Bayana, see M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Bayana During Sultanate of Delhi', P.R.H.C., Udaipur, 1969, pp. 49-50.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., 160; Badauni, M.T., Vol. I, p. 266.

6. J.I.H., August, 1963.

position to the Khanzada chief, especially during the period of anarchy that followed Timur's departure from Hindustan.

Saiyyid Khizr Khan:

Saiyyid Khizr Khan, who assumed sovereign powers on 15th Rabi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 817/4th June, 1414 A.D.,¹ actively participated in Mewat affairs even during the period of his governorship of Lahore and Dipalpur. It would therefore, not be an exaggeration to say that he aimed at capturing the throne of Delhi by showing his prowess in Mewat.

As early as A.H. 814/1411-12 A.D. he marched through Rohtak and devastated the Mewat territories under the possession of Bahadur Nahir including Tijara, Sarhath and Kharol.² A second attempt was made to subjugate Mewat in A.H. 816/1413 A.D.³

An attempt to capture Bayana was made in A.H. 819/1416-17 A.D., when Tajul Mulk was despatched there.

-
1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 183; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 266.
 2. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 179; Ahmad, T.A., p. 263. Tijara lies 30 miles n.e. of Alwar. For Babur's description of the fortress of Tijara, see B.H., tr. Beveridge, Vol. II, p. 578. See also Powlett, Gazetteer of Alwar, p. 132; K.S.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 59. fn. 84. Sarhath is four miles east of Tijara. Kharol is Cahrol, now a ruined town. K.S.Lal, op.cit., p. 59, fn. 85.
 3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 181.

The Rai of the place paid the usual tribute and escaped devastation of his territories.¹ The reference to the Hindu Rai at Bayana is difficult to understand since the same source tells us that Shams Khan Auhadi was the incharge of the fortress during Khizr Khan's rule.²

A last attempt was made by the Sultan to annex Mewat in A.H. 824/1421 A.D. Bahadur Nahir had sheltered many chiefs and was unmindful of central authority. As soon as the Delhi troops reached his territories, the Mewatis retired towards the interior parts. Kotla, the abode of the Khanzada chief, was levelled to ground.³ It, however, seems that nothing beyond the usual payment of tribute was achieved during the course of this campaign.

Khizr Khan's march towards Nagaur:

The Sultan's nominal hold over the south western regions of his empire encouraged the powerful adjoining states to invade these territories. Sultan Ahmad Shah of Gujarat, invaded Nagaur in Rajab, A.H. 819/August-Sept. 1416 A.D. Saiyyid Khizr Khan when conveyed the news, immediately proceeded towards Nagaur. The Sultan of Gujarat having heard about the approach of Saiyyid Khizr Khan,

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 185.

2. Ibid., p. 186.

3. Ibid., p. 192.

retired towards Dhar. Sultan entered Chhain, where Ilyas Khan, incharge of the place submitted to him.¹

It would thus seem that Khizr Khan had succeeded in asserting his authority over Nagaur and Chhain (i.e. the Ranthambhor territory), besides Mewat and Bayana. But Ajmer had apparently been lost to Marwar in 1405.²

Saiyyid Mubarak Shah:

Inspite of the repeated onslaughts of Saiyyid Khizr Khan, the position in Mewat remained rather flued till the death of the Sultan (17th Jamadi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 824/20th May, 1421 A.D.).³ The Mewatis were adapt in recovering speedily any part that was devastated by the royal forces. The region remained refractory as ever and even the nominal acknowledgement required an invasion.

The attention of Sultan Mubarak Shah was also engaged seriously in the region but inspite of his repeated attempts, the region could not be annexed. The Sultan some time after 1423 is reported to have proceeded towards Gwalior via Bayana since Auhad Khan's son Mubarak Khan had assassinated his uncle and had revolted against the Sultan.

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 186;
Ahmad, T.A., p. 267.

2. See Infra, p. 290.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 192.

Consequent upon the approach of the royal troops, he vacated his residence and retired towards the hills. The Sultan pursued him thither and compelled him to acknowledge his sovereignty.¹

In the following year, the Mewatis rose in rebellion and Sultan was obliged to wage a war against them. The rebels, as on previous occasion, vacated the fortress and retired to a mountaneous region named Jahra (unidentified). The further project, due to the impregnability of the fortress and the short supply of food-grain and fodder had to be abandoned and the Sultan returned to Delhi in A.H. 828/1425 A.D.²

The following year, another attempt was made and we are told that Jallu and Qaddu (Jalal Khan and Qaddar Khan) the grandsons of Bahadur Nahir along with their associates, deserted their abode and retired towards Indur. The royal forces under Mubarak Shah surrounded that place and consequently the rebels took shelter in the Alwar hills. Being pursued and hard pressed by the Sultan, Jallu and Qaddu begged for royal mercy, which was easily granted. Qaddu, however, tried to run away but was arrested. After pillaging the regions of Mewat for sometime, the Sultan

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 202.

2. Ibid., p. 204.

returned to the capital.¹

The region thus remained refractory as usual and the Sultan was forced to march there again in next Muharram. (November-December 1426). When the Sultan reached Bayana, Auhad Khan's son Muhammad Khan, shut himself up in the fortress. The siege continued for sixteen days and Auhad Khan being attacked from the rear gate of the fortress, was obliged to surrender. He was pardoned by Sultan, but all his valuables were acquired and Malik Maqbul was appointed to his Iqta.²

All these measures, however, did not improve the position and soon Muhammad Khan, who had settled at Delhi, managed to flee to his own territory and associated himself with the other rebels. Meanwhile Sultan heard that Malik Maqbul, had gone with his entire forces towards Mahaban. The Sultan appointed Malik Mubariz Khan at Bayana and himself started against Muhammad Khan. Mubariz Khan occupied the whole territory of Bayana at which Muhammad fled to Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi, with whom he took shelter.³

1. Yahya, T.M.S., pp. 204-205;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 276.

2. Yahya, T.M.S., pp. 205-206;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 276.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 206.
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 277.

The project of a renewed invasion of Bayana had to be abandoned in 1427 A.D. at the news of the attack of the Sharqi Sultan. The following year, Mubarak Shah after his return from Gwalior, crossed the Chambal and marched to Bayana. The siege lasted for a week. Muhammad Khan Auhadi, because of the scarcity of water in the fortress, begged for his safety, which was unhasitatingly granted. However, the arrangement did not last long. No sooner had the royal forces started towards the capital when Muhammad Khan proceeded towards Mewat. (11th May, 1428 A.D.). The Sultan now appointed Malik-ul-Sharq Malik Mahmud Hasan as incharge of the fortress and its nearby places.¹

Only two months after this arrangement, (July-August, 1428), the affairs of Mewat compelled the Sultan to despatch Sarwar-ul-Mulk against Qaddar Khan (Kaddu), because the latter had joined with Ibrahim Sharqi. The commander pursued Qaddu and his followers, who fled towards Idar and Sarwar-ul-Mulk returned to the capital after negotiations.²

In Muharram A.H. 832/October-November 1428 A.D., Malik-ul Sharq Malik Mahmud Hasan was again despatched against Bayana. Muhammad Khan Auhadi came for negotiations

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 210.

2. Ibid., p. 211.

at Delhi and was given the Iqta of Hissar Feroza.¹ Sometime after this Sultan halted at 'Kushak' on his way towards Mewat, where he is told to have accepted the presents from Iqbal Khan and the other Mewatis.²

The period of next four years was comparatively of some relief since the Sultan remained busy with the Panjab affairs.

In Rabi-ul Awwal, A.H. 836/October-November, 1432 A.D., Sultan again pitched up his camp in Mewat hills. Jalal Khan Mewati hid himself into the fortress of Indur (Alwar), which was considered to be one of the most impregnable fortresses. The siege having lasted for sometime, Jalal submitted and the Sultan consequently returned Delhi via Tijara and Mewat.³ Two years after this the Sultan was murdered (9th Rajab, A.H. 837/11th February, 1434 A.D.).⁴

Saiyyid Muhammad Shah:

It appears from the statement of Yahya that the late Sultan was assassinated by Sarwar-ul-Mulk in alliance with Miran-i-Sadar and some Hindus like Sadharan, Gangu and

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 213.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 227.

4. Ibid., p. 234.

Meanwhile Malik Bahlol Lodi, the governor of Dipalpur and Lahore, marched towards Delhi and succeeded in capturing the throne. Alaud-Din abandoned the throne in Bahlul's favour and died after some years at Badaun, his death marking the close of the Saiyyid dynasty.¹

It is obvious that the subjugation of Mewat could not be effected during the rule of Saiyyids and the Mewati Khanzadas indulged in all sorts of refractory activities like sheltering the rebellious chiefs, inviting powerful chiefs for help and extending their sphere of influence, whenever they got the slightest opportunity.

Mewar:

It has been related earlier that the energies of the Saiyyid rulers were confined to Mewat principality only so far as Rajasthan was concerned. We know only one solitary instance when Saiyyid Khizr Khan had proceeded as far as Nagaur.² The interior of Rajasthan practically remained undisturbed from the invasions of the Saiyyid Sultans of Delhi. This gave a free hand to the Mewar rulers to extend their power and prestige. The first half of the fifteenth century, therefore, was a period of uninterrupted succession of the Sesodia chiefs and Mewar principality reached its zenith under remarkable rulers like Maharana Kumbha (1433-68).

1. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 293-94.

2. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 186; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 267. For details see Supra, pp. 272-73.

Sidhpala.¹ These Hindus associates of Sarwar-ul Mulk, after the accession of Muhammad Shah rendered him allegiance but practically remained unmindful of his authority.²

After having reserved some Iqtas for himself, Sarwar-ul-Mulk conferred the other Parganas, including that of Bayana upon Sidhpala, Sadharan and his kinsmen.³ Meanwhile Sidhpala's slave Ran Siah proceeded towards Bayana to capture the fortress. However, when he was planning to attack the fortress, he heard about the approach of Yusuf Khan Auhadi (24th March, 1434 A.D.) in a battle that ensued, the Hindu forces were defeated and Ran Siah was killed.⁴

After Muhammad Shah's death (1443-44), Sultan Alaud-Din bin Muhammad Shah was seated on the throne of Delhi. It was perhaps due to the repeated invasions of Sultan Mubarak Shah over Mewat, that the region remained peaceful for sometime under Muhammad. Ahmad Khan Mewati came to the court of the new Sultan in 1438 to pay his obeisance.⁵

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 234.

2. Ibid., p. 237.

3. Ibid., p. 238; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 288. Rai Sidhpala and other Hindus were killed in an attempt to murder the Sultan.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 238; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 290.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 243. It is obvious that the subjugation of Mewat could not be effected during the period of the Saiyyids.

Lakshman Simha:

After the death of Kshetra Singh (1405), his eldest son Lakshman Simha succeeded to the throne and ruled up to 1421.¹

Although there was no interference in the internal affairs of Mewar by Saiyyid rulers, the kingdom throughout the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries remained at war with her neighbouring Muslim rulers of Gujarat and Malwa, who had established independent provincial Sultanates.

Lakshman Simha is said to have defeated the Sultan of Delhi near Badnor and got exemption from the pilgrimage tax, imposed on the Hindus for their visits to holy places like Kashi, Gaya and Paryag. The exemption was sought by paying huge gold coins and horses as presents by the Rana.² The principalities over which Rana is said to have won victories, included places like Badnor, (under Mers), Bundi (under Rao Vir Singh Hada), Jahaspur, Merwara, Nagrachal (Shekhawati) and the fortress of Vairat.³

1. For the Sanskrit inscription referring to Lakshman Simha see Eklinga Inscription E.I., p. 119, verse 38.

2. Ibid.

3. See Eklinga Inscription, verse 35; E.I., p. 119; Chittor Inscription, verse 38; Kumbhalgad Inscription of V.S. 1517/1460 A.D.; Shyamal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 305; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 322; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., pp. 571-72.

Lakshman Simha's rule on the whole, witnessed a general economic prosperity and cultural attainments, including construction of a number of tanks, forts and temples, some of which had been demolished earlier during the rule of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.¹

The marriage of the prince at an advanced age, with Rannmalla Rathor's sister Hansabai, the daughter of Rao Chunda Rathor, (1390-1442) brought the Sesodias closer to the Rathors.² Rana Mokai, who was born out of this alliance, became the successor to Mewar throne, despite the legitimate claims of Lakha's eldest son Rao Chunda Sesodia.³

Rana Kokai:

Rana Mokai succeeded to the throne of Mewar after Lakshman Simha. During Mokai's childhood, Sesodia Chunda acted as his regent. However, later on, due to Hansabai's suspicion, Rao Chunda left Mewar and took shelter with the Malwa Sultan, Hoshang Shah. With the exit of Rao Chunda Sesodia, the affairs of Mewar came to be controlled by Rannmalla and his Rathor associates.⁴

-
1. B.I., p. 98, Verse 42; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 321; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 305; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 260-62.
 2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 15.
 3. Ibid.,; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 323.
 4. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 311-12; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 271-72.

Meanwhile, due to the family feuds among Rathors, the seat of Mandor (1410) came into possession of the Rana of Mewar and was given over to Rammalla.¹ The Rana is said to have waged successful wars against Muslim rulers of Nagaur² (Firuz Khan) and the Gujarat Sultan Ahmad Shah³ and the Rajput principalities of Bundi, Sambhar and Jalor.⁴

The king of the Yavanas, named Peroja is recorded to have been defeated by prince Mokal in a Sanskrit inscription of V.S. 1485/1428 A.D.⁵ The inscription after tracing the geneology of the Guhila princes from Arisimha to Mokal, records the latter to have defeated Peroja.⁶

Since the dates of Rana Mokal range from V.S. 1478 to 1490/1421-1433 A.D.,⁷ it is not possible that the prince

1. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 312-13.
2. E.I., Vol. II, p. 417; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 316.
3. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 13(4); Ferishta, T.E., p.
4. Chittorgarh Inscription of Rana Mokal of Mewar, Kielhorn, (ed.) E.I., Vol. II, p. 417, verse 51.
 "... यवन् नरपतिं युधिष्ठिराभिरु सेनं परोजं ।
 श्रीविजयस्य पुत्रस्य मरुगिरि-पुत्रोत्पत्त्यात् ॥ "
5. Ibid.
6. Bhandarkar's List, pp. 106-07, No. 763. Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 331. Tod erroneously states that it was Timur who was defeated by Rana Mokal.

defeated Sultan Firuz Tughluq. A possible identification of Firuz Khan may be Firuz Khan Dandani, the chief of Nagaur, who according to Kyam Khan Raso was defeated by Rana Mokal,¹ in the battle in which Kyam Khan's son Taj Khan and Muhammad Khan were also present.²

Like his father, Mokai constructed and renovated a number of temples etc., and liberally distributed gold and silver, as is mentioned in the Bringirishi and other inscriptions.³ He was assassinated by his uncles Chacha and Mera in V.S. 1490/1433 A.D.⁴

Maharaja Kumbha Karna:

Maharana Kumbha succeeded his father Mokal in V.S. 1490/1433 A.D. A large number of Sanskrit inscriptions⁸ speak in high terms about the Maharana. A major part of the Maharana's reign was spent in warfare against the neighbouring kingdoms.

1. Kyam Khan Raso, text, pp. 29-30.
2. Ibid., text, p. 29.

गान-यल्लो पेरुओ रवां लाली है नागोए।
पादे ओवे मुंदले माकेमालि सिमारे ॥”

3. Sringirishi Inscription, verse 14; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., pp. 587-88; Chittoor Inscription of V.S. 1585, E.I., Vol. II, pp. 418-19.
4. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 315; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 278.
5. For details, see Ram Vallabh Somani, 'Copper Plate grant of M.Kumbha, dated V.S. 1494 from Nandia'. Maru Bharati, (July, 1968), Vol. XVI, (11), p. 53.

The first task to which the Maharana applied himself was to get Chacha and Mera assassinated. However, Chacha's son Eka and Mahpa Panwar managed to flee towards Mandu, where they took shelter with the Mandu ruler.¹

The Muslim Sultans of Malwa and Gujarat were, as would be seen, waiting for every possible chance to extend their territories, for which purpose they entered into an alliance against their common foe that is the Mewar ruler Maharana Kumbha.

As a result of the growing power of Mewar, the Sultan of Malwa could hardly contemplate an aggressive attitude towards Mewar then in possession of Rana Mokal, the youngest son of Lakshman Simha. After Lakshman's death, when young Mokal succeeded to the throne, Chunda (Sesodia) looked after the affairs of the state. The latter, however, had to vacate the place owing to his differences with his step mother Hansabai, who suspected Chunda's intentions.²

Rao Chunda found an easy refuge with the Malwa Sultan Hoshang Shah (1406-34) and the latter not only extended a cordial reception to him but even allotted him some land for maintenance.³ This has been referred to as a political

1. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 319.

2. Ibid., p. 311; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, pp. 324-25.

3. Ibid., p. 311; Ibid., p. 224.

far-sightedness on the part of the Malwa Sultan, who succeeded in creating a 'Rajput buffer against Chittor'.¹

The Ghuri dynasty of Malwa, however, was soon superseded by the Khaljis. The short rule of the last Ghuri ruler Ghazni Khan entitled Muhammad Ghuri (1435-1436) encouraged the Rajputs of Harauti, to assert their independence by invading certain territories of Malwa.²

During this period, Mahmud Khan (Khalji) controlled the affairs of the state and later on he succeeded in securing the throne for himself (1436) after poisoning Sultan Muhammad Ghuri.³

With the accession of Kumbha over Mewar and Mahmud Khalji over Malwa, the situation however, changed. Both the chiefs were over-ambitious and before a final contest for supremacy, each of them desired to curb the sphere of influence of the other by subjugating the territories lying on the Malwa-Mewar border. Neither of them risked a direct invasion at the initial stage.

The reasons of the unavoidable clash primarily lay in three fold circumstances. First, Sesodias had all along been very busy to assert his supremacy over the border

1. U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 65.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

3. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. III, p. 309;
 Ferishta, T.E., Vol. II, p. 471.

principalities of Harauti and Daur¹ etc., to gain an upper hand over his rival Muslim kingdom. Secondly, as already stated, Kumbha demanded Mahapa Panwar back from the Sultan Mahmud,² and this gave the Maharana an easy excuse to adopt an aggressive role. Sultan Mahmud, however, could not afford to risk a war at least during the first five years of his reign, because of his other rival Sultan of Gujarat who was keen to take advantage of the situation.³

The immediate reason, perhaps, lay in family feuds. Khem Karana, the Rana's brother, who was not satisfied with the fief assigned to him, forcibly occupied Bari Sadari.⁴ This resulted in his expulsion from the territory of Mewar. Khem Karana however, found a safe shelter with the Malwa Sultan, probably by 1441,⁵ since the latter was also his brother's foe. Khem Karana in alliance with the Sultan continued to be a source of trouble throughout the Rana's life.

The circumstances were now ripe for Sultan Mahmud to invade Chittor, since he not only got active assistance

1. Supra, pp. 257-58.

2. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 320; H.B. Sarda, Maharana Kumbha, p. 51. Similarly Rana is also told to have given shelter to Shahzada Umar Khan son of Sultan Hoshang Shah and thus interfered in the internal affairs of Malwa. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 327.

2. U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 170.

3. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, p. 1053; Nainsi, H.K., Vol. I, p. 93.

4. U.N.Dey, op.cit., p. 171.

from Khen Karana,¹ but was also free from the side of Gujarat owing to the death of Ahmad Shah.

Battle at Sarangpur:

The Rajput accounts boast of a complete victory over Sultan Mahmud in the battle that was fought at Sarangpur.² It is however, difficult to say that either of the parties won a complete victory.

Initially the Sultan started (1442) via Sarangpur and then turned towards Kilwara,³ which was a stronghold belonging to Maharana Kumbha. Next the Sultan crossed Bitan⁴ and reached Machhinderpur fort, which is probably the present Kumbhalmer.⁵ The temple of Ban Mata noted for its fortifications was defended by Dip Singh for a week but was ultimately occupied by the Malwa forces.⁶ The Sultan's forces next marched to Pankara and sacked the place. The

1. G.H.Ojha, H.R.I., Vol. I, p.

2. Ranakpur Inscription, R.I., p. 114.
According to Rajput version, in the severe battle that was fought at Sarangpur, Sultan was defeated and imprisoned by Rana. After about 6 months' imprisonment he was released unconditionally. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, fl. 127 (b), cited in U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 173. It lies about 2 miles south of Kumbhalgadh.

3. Ibid., folio, 128 (b)

4. U.N.Dey, op.cit., pp. 173-74.

5. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 324-25.

6. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, folio 130 (a).

forces now proceeded towards Chittor and ravaged Chaumuha. Here a night attack was led by Maharana (April, 1443), which, however, was repulsed by Mahmud's forces.¹ No decisive victory was thus gained by either side and the Sultan is reported to have returned to his capital, declaring that he would invade Chittor next year.²

It would thus be seen that all the invasions down to the middle to the fifteenth century were indecisive in nature and the Muslim forces could do no better than plundering some portions of the Mewar principality. The drawn wars were claimed as victories by both the sides, who commemorated these victories by erecting victory towers at Chittor and Mandu respectively. Mahmud followed a policy of weakening the position of the Rana by devastating his principalities.

Marwar:

Like Mewar another state which became prominent during the period under review, was that of the Rathor State of Marwar.³ From its foundation by Rao Siha Ji during the last quarter of the thirteenth century to Rao Chunda, the history of Marwar was a period of struggle for existence.

1. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, folio, 130 (a).
Cf. U.N. Day, Medieval Malwa, p. 175.

2. Ferishta, T.E., Vol. II, p. 488.

3. For establishment and early history of the Rathors of Marwar, see Supra, pp. 213-218.

During this period most of the Rathor chiefs died in a bid to keep their territories intact.¹

Rao Chunda:

Like his other Rajput and the Muslim neighbours, the principality of Marwar took full advantage of the weak Saiyyid rulers. Rao Chunda who occupied the throne by the close of the fourteenth century, availed of every possible chance to extend his hold over the adjoining territories. The Rajput accounts refer to his early career as that of a free-booter. This was during the period when he held the fief of village Salodi.²

Immediately after his accession Rao Chunda with the help of Idar Parihars, captured Mandor,³ which was then

1. For details see M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Marwar and the Sultans of Delhi', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, Jaipur, 1968, pp. 51-54.
2. B.N. Rau, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 59.
3. Nainsi, (N.K., Vol. II, pp. 308-09), states that the Muslim official demanded grazing grass from the Idar Parihars who were living in the adjoining region. The Parihars, thinking it as an insult, attacked the Muslim garrison in disguise of the soldiers and expelled the Muslims from Mandor. The Rathor occupation of Mandor is known from the following couplet:

३६२१ ३५८८, १११४४ १८ १८११ १८११
 १८११ १८११ १८११ १८११ १८११ १८११ ॥

B.N. Rau, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 60-61.

under a Mandu governor. Mandor was possibly occupied in V.S. 1451/1394 A.D.¹ This is known from an inscription of the above date found from village Chawanda (about 7 miles from Jodhpur), where Rao Chunda built a temple known after his family diety Chamunda.²

Soon, however, the expansionist designs of Rao Chunda, engaged the attention of the governor of Gujarat Zafar Khan, who according to Mirat-i-Sikandari,³ besieged Mandor fort in A.H. 798/1396 A.D. He could not possess the fortress even after a prolonged siege and returned after accepting nominal acknowledgement of Rao Chunda.

The invasion of Timur gave a further lease to Rao Chunda who now occupied other Muslim strongholds like Nagaur (1399), Khatu, Didwana, Sambhar, Ajmer (1405) and Nadol.⁴ The principality of Nagaur, however, remained a bone of contention between the Rathors and the Muslims and the

1. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 61, fn.4.

2. Ibid.

3. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 33. The name in the chronicle is wrongly written as Mandu. Mandu was already under Muslim possession.

4. The victories of Rana Kumbha enlisted in Ranakpur inscription of V.S. 1496/1439 A.D., included Sarangpur, Nagaur, Gagraun, Naraina, Ajmer, Mandor, Mandalgadh, Bundi, Khatu, Chatsu etc. However, the credit of these victories goes to Rammalla and his Rathor followers, since Kumbha was hardly 12 or 13 years at the time of the date of inscription. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 34.

subsequent events show that it frequently changed hands between the two.¹

Nagaur was recaptured (1408) by the Gujarat Sultan Muzaffar Shah I,² with the help of Shams Khan, who possibly retained it till 1416, when it was recovered by Khizr Khan. The place was, however, regained by Rathor chief in 1421, when it was held by Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan.

Nagaur was however, not destined to remain permanently a Rathor possession. Sometime afterwards Salim (probably a Muslim governor of Multan on behalf of the Saiyyids) invaded Nagaur with the help of Sankhla of Janglu³ and Bhatia of Jaisalmer.⁴ In the battle that ensued Rao Chunda was killed.⁵

Rao Kumbha Rathor:

The struggle for the possession of Nagaur continued during the short rule of the successor of Chunda. Firstly Pimpala Sankhla of Janglu region who had been ravaging

1. Hainsi, N.K., tr., Vol. II, pp. 310-11;
Bankedas Khyat, p. 6.

2. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 33.

3. Janglu lies 25 miles north of Nagaur.

4. Hainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 313; Bankedas Khyat, Vol. I, p. 6; Tod, Annals, Vol. II, pp. 845, 733. Tod wrongly assigns the death of Rao Chunda in 1419. An inscription of 1421 referring to Rao Chunda is extant. For inscription, see B.N. Rau, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 65-66, fn. 2, 3.

5. Hainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 315.

territories, was put to rest. Kanha's efforts to regain Nagaur, however, failed, since Shams Khan's son Firuz along with some other refractories, invaded and occupied Nagaur. As a result of this the Rathor chief retreated to Mandor, his original seat.¹

Rao Satta, the next successor, was soon ousted by Rannmalla, (who had been living at Mewar) in a battle at Mandor in 1427. Satta and his son Narbad consequently retired to Mewar and were granted a fief by Rana Mokai.²

Rannmalla Rathor:

Rannmalla the eldest son of Rao Chunda had been living with Rana Lakshman Simha of Mewar. During his stay at Mewar he captured Ajmer for Rana Lakshman Simha³ and married his sister Hansabai to the Rana.⁴ The Rathor-Sesodia alliance thus proved beneficial for the time being for both powers. Rannmalla is said to have defeated the Muslim forces a number of times during his stay at Mewar.

Rannmalla continued to control the affairs of Mewar even after the succession of Rana Mokai - a product of the

1. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 68.

2. Ibid., p. 70.

3. Ibid., p. 71.

4. Bankedas Khyat, p. 6.

Mewar-Marwar alliance. The conquests of Ranmalla included Rajput territories of Nadol, (under Sonigara Chauhans), Jaisalmer (under Bhatias), Jaitran (under Sindhal Rathors), Sojat (from Hulas), Mandor (under his brother Satta).¹

Apart from his own battles listed above which continued till 1428, Ranmalla continued to assist Mokal in Mewar administration and is said to have captured Siwalak, Jalor, Sambhar, Jahaspur etc., on behalf of the Sesodia Rana.²

Ranmalla led a second invasion against Jaisalmer in 1430 and Maharawal Lakshman Simha Bhati purchased peace by marrying his daughter to him.³

During Ranmalla's reign, Jalor was in possession of Hasan Khan Pathan. The latter seems to have interfered in the territories belonging to Rao Ranmalla, as a result of which Rao despatched Rathor Uda against him. Hasan resisted for sometime but eventually concluded a treaty due to shortage of food supply.⁴

Ranmalla played a significant role in so far as the new Mewar-Marwar alliance was concerned. Chacha and Mera

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 331, 336, 343;
Bankedas Khyat, p. 7.

2. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 72-73.

3. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 336.

4. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 75.

the murderers of Rana Mokel were put to death by Rannalla after a hot chase for about six months.¹ Mahpa Panwar, however, escaped and took shelter with Mahmud Khalji,² the Sultan of Mandu.

Rannalla, accordingly sent a message to the Sultan to return the fugitives. When he did not receive an affirmative reply, he attacked Mandu with the combined forces of Mewar and Marwar in V.S. 1534/1537 A.D. The consequences of the battle fought at Sarangpur have already been narrated in the history of Mewar.³

The influential position which Rannalla enjoyed for a long period in Mewar politics, however, ultimately turned against him. Chacha's son Ala and Mahpa Panwar returned to Chittor and won over the confidence of Rana Kumbha.⁴ The latter acting on their instructions, treacherously murdered Rana Rannalla Rathor in 1495/1438 A.D.⁵

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 337-39.

2. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 76.

3. See Supra, pp. 287-88.

4. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 339-41.

5. Ibid.; Bankedās Khyat, p. 7; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 325 date the event in V.S. 1500/1443 A.D. Tod & Suryamal also refer the assassination of Rannalla during Mokel's period. (Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 332 and Vamsa bhaskar, Vol. III, p. 1872 respectively). Ranakpur Jaina Temple Inscription dated V.S. 1496/1439 A.D. shows that Mandor must have been captured by Kumbha before this date. A.S.I., 1907-08, p. 214.

With the assassination of Rannmalla, the temporary foundation of Mewar and Marwar union¹ received a terrible blow. The Rathors under Jodha were compelled to start a struggle for regaining their ancestral territories from the Sesodia hold but their efforts did not succeed before the second half of the fifteenth century.

*

1. For Mewar-Marwar alliance in 15th century see also B.N.Reu, Glories of Marwar and the Glorious Rathors, (Jodhpur, 1943), pp. 183-85.

CHAPTER * XIITHE SAIYYIDS AND MEWAT

All authority of the Tughluq Sultans over large parts of Rajasthan, seems to have disappeared, with the death of Firuz and the invasion of Timur. Henceforth the ambitions of the Delhi authorities appear to have become confined to recovering or maintaining control over Mewat and Bayana in eastern Rajasthan, besides the important town of Nagaur in Central Rajasthan.

It has already been mentioned that the region of Mewat which included the modern Rajasthan districts of Alwar and Bharatpur, apart from Mathura and Gurgaon, remained a source of constant trouble and centre of seditious activities till Balban's reign.¹

As a result of Balban's stern measures against the region, the Khalji period witnessed some pause from the Mewati disturbances. The silence about Mewat continued even after the period of Alaud-Din Khalji, perhaps due to the drastic action of the Sultan against rebels like the Jalali nobles and the 'Neo Mussalman'.²

1. Supra, pp. 120-121 and 130-131.

2. B.S.Mathur, 'Mewat Affairs during Sultanate period', J.I.H., Vol. XLV, part 11, August 1967, p. 513.

Under Sultan Firuz Tughluq, a considerable section of the Hindu population of the northern parts of Mewat was converted to Islam. This is known from the traditional records of the family histories and the tradition of the Khanzadas of Mewat.¹ However, the reference to Koka Chauhan ruling at Macheri (about 25 miles from Alwar) certainly suggests that parts of the region remained under the Rajputs.²

It goes beyond doubt that the Yaduvansi Rajputs, who were the original occupants of the principality of Bayana, accepted Islam under their leader Bahadur Nahir,³ who became the leader of the Khanzadas.⁴

During Timur's invasion, Bahadur Nahir watched the political developments quietly. He gave shelter to a number of Delhi fugitives including the future ruler Saiyyid Khizr Khan.⁵ There is also a reference of Timur's sending an envoy to Bahadur Nahir⁶ which perhaps gave an advantageous

1. J.I.H., Vol. XLV, part II, p. 518.; K.B.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 58, fn. 83.

2. Supra, p. 263, fn. 1.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 138; Badauni, M.T., p. 254; Hodivala, Studies in Indo Muslim History, p. 390; J.I.H., Vol. XXXVIII, 1960.

4. For a detailed notice of the Khansada chiefs of Bayana, see M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Bayana During Sultanate of Delhi', P.R.H.C., Udaipur, 1969, pp. 49-50.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., 160; Badauni, M.T., Vol. I, p. 266.

6. J.I.H., August, 1963.

position to the Khanzada chief, especially during the period of anarchy that followed Timur's departure from Hindustan.

Saiyyid Khizr Khan:

Saiyyid Khizr Khan, who assumed sovereign powers on 15th Rabi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 817/4th June, 1414 A.D.,¹ actively participated in Mewat affairs even during the period of his governorship of Lahore and Dipalpur. It would therefore, not be an exaggeration to say that he aimed at capturing the throne of Delhi by showing his prowess in Mewat.

As early as A.H. 814/1411-12 A.D. he marched through Rohtak and devastated the Mewat territories under the possession of Bahadur Nahir including Tijara, Sarhath and Kharol.² A second attempt was made to subjugate Mewat in A.H. 816/1413 A.D.³

An attempt to capture Bayana was made in A.H. 819/1416-17 A.D., when Tajul Mulk was despatched there.

-
1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 183; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 266.
 2. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 179; Ahmad, T.A., p. 263. Tijara lies 30 miles n.e. of Alwar. For Babur's description of the fortress of Tijara, see B.H., tr. Beveridge, Vol. II, p. 578. See also Powlett, Gazetteer of Alwar, p. 132; K.S.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 59. fn. 84. Sarhath is four miles east of Tijara. Kharol is Cahrol, now a ruined town. K.S.Lal, op.cit., p. 59, fn. 85.
 3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 181.

The Rai of the place paid the usual tribute and escaped devastation of his territories.¹ The reference to the Hindu Rai at Bayana is difficult to understand since the same source tells us that Shams Khan Auhadi was the incharge of the fortress during Khizr Khan's rule.²

A last attempt was made by the Sultan to annex Mewat in A.H. 824/1421 A.D. Bahadur Nahir had sheltered many chiefs and was unmindful of central authority. As soon as the Delhi troops reached his territories, the Mewatis retired towards the interior parts. Kotla, the abode of the Khanzada chief, was levelled to ground.³ It, however, seems that nothing beyond the usual payment of tribute was achieved during the course of this campaign.

Khizr Khan's march towards Nagaur:

The Sultan's nominal hold over the south western regions of his empire encouraged the powerful adjoining states to invade these territories. Sultan Ahmad Shah of Gujarat, invaded Nagaur in Rajab, A.H. 819/August-Sept. 1416 A.D. Saiyyid Khizr Khan when conveyed the news, immediately proceeded towards Nagaur. The Sultan of Gujarat having heard about the approach of Saiyyid Khizr Khan,

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 185.

2. Ibid., p. 186.

3. Ibid., p. 192.

retired towards Dhar. Sultan entered Chhain, where Ilyas Khan, incharge of the place submitted to him.¹

It would thus seem that Khizr Khan had succeeded in asserting his authority over Nagaur and Chhain (i.e. the Ranthambhor territory), besides Mewat and Bayana. But Ajmer had apparently been lost to Marwar in 1405.²

Saiyyid Mubarak Shah:

Inspite of the repeated onslaughts of Saiyyid Khizr Khan, the position in Mewat remained rather flued till the death of the Sultan (17th Jamadi-ul-Awwal, A.H. 824/20th May, 1421 A.D.).³ The Mewatis were adapt in recovering speedily any part that was devastated by the royal forces. The region remained refractory as ever and even the nominal acknowledgement required an invasion.

The attention of Sultan Mubarak Shah was also engaged seriously in the region but inspite of his repeated attempts, the region could not be annexed. The Sultan some time after 1423 is reported to have proceeded towards Gwalior via Bayana since Auhad Khan's son Mubarak Khan had assassinated his uncle and had revolted against the Sultan.

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 186;
Ahmad, T.A., p. 267.

2. See Infra, p. 290.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 192.

Consequent upon the approach of the royal troops, he vacated his residence and retired towards the hills. The Sultan pursued him thither and compelled him to acknowledge his sovereignty.¹

In the following year, the Mewatis rose in rebellion and Sultan was obliged to wage a war against them. The rebels, as on previous occasion, vacated the fortress and retired to a mountaneous region named Jahra (unidentified). The further project, due to the impregnability of the fortress and the short supply of food-grain and fodder had to be abandoned and the Sultan returned to Delhi in A.H. 828/1425 A.D.²

The following year, another attempt was made and we are told that Jallu and Qaddu (Jalal Khan and Qaddar Khan) the grandsons of Bahadur Nahir along with their associates, deserted their abode and retired towards Indur. The royal forces under Mubarak Shah surrounded that place and consequently the rebels took shelter in the Alwar hills. Being pursued and hard pressed by the Sultan, Jallu and Qaddu begged for royal mercy, which was easily granted. Qaddu, however, tried to run away but was arrested. After pillaging the regions of Mewat for sometime, the Sultan

1. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 202.

2. Ibid., p. 204.

returned to the capital.¹

The region thus remained refractory as usual and the Sultan was forced to march there again in next Muharram. (November-December 1426). When the Sultan reached Bayana, Auhad Khan's son Muhammad Khan, shut himself up in the fortress. The siege continued for sixteen days and Auhad Khan being attacked from the rear gate of the fortress, was obliged to surrender. He was pardoned by Sultan, but all his valuables were acquired and Malik Maqbul was appointed to his Iqta.²

All these measures, however, did not improve the position and soon Muhammad Khan, who had settled at Delhi, managed to flee to his own territory and associated himself with the other rebels. Meanwhile Sultan heard that Malik Maqbul, had gone with his entire forces towards Mahaban. The Sultan appointed Malik Mubariz Khan at Bayana and himself started against Muhammad Khan. Mubariz Khan occupied the whole territory of Bayana at which Muhammad fled to Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi, with whom he took shelter.³

1. Yahya, T.M.S., pp. 204-205;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 276.

2. Yahya, T.M.S., pp. 205-206;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 276.

3. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 206.
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 277.

The project of a renewed invasion of Bayana had to be abandoned in 1427 A.D. at the news of the attack of the Sharqi Sultan. The following year, Mubarak Shah after his return from Gwalior, crossed the Chambal and marched to Bayana. The siege lasted for a week. Muhammad Khan Auhadi, because of the scarcity of water in the fortress, begged for his safety, which was unhasitatingly granted. However, the arrangement did not last long. No sooner had the royal forces started towards the capital when Muhammad Khan proceeded towards Mewat. (11th May, 1428 A.D.). The Sultan now appointed Malik-ul-Sharq Malik Mahmud Hasan as incharge of the fortress and its nearby places.¹

Only two months after this arrangement, (July-August, 1428), the affairs of Mewat compelled the Sultan to despatch Sarwar-ul-Mulk against Qaddar Khan (Kaddu), because the latter had joined with Ibrahim Sharqi. The commander pursued Qaddu and his followers, who fled towards Idar and Sarwar-ul-Mulk returned to the capital after negotiations.²

In Muharram A.H. 832/October-November 1428 A.D., Malik-ul Sharq Malik Mahmud Hasan was again despatched against Bayana. Muhammad Khan Auhadi came for negotiations

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 210.

2. Ibid., p. 211.

at Delhi and was given the Iqta of Hissar Feroza.¹ Sometime after this Sultan halted at 'Kushak' on his way towards Mewat, where he is told to have accepted the presents from Iqbal Khan and the other Mewatis.²

The period of next four years was comparatively of some relief since the Sultan remained busy with the Panjab affairs.

In Rabi-ul Awwal, A.H. 836/October-November, 1432 A.D., Sultan again pitched up his camp in Mewat hills. Jalal Khan Mewati hid himself into the fortress of Indur (Alwar), which was considered to be one of the most impregnable fortresses. The siege having lasted for sometime, Jalal submitted and the Sultan consequently returned Delhi via Tijara and Mewat.³ Two years after this the Sultan was murdered (9th Rajab, A.H. 837/11th February, 1434 A.D.).⁴

Saiyyid Muhammad Shah:

It appears from the statement of Yahya that the late Sultan was assassinated by Sarwar-ul-Mulk in alliance with Miran-i-Sadar and some Hindus like Sadharan, Gangu and

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 213.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 227.

4. Ibid., p. 234.

Meanwhile Malik Bahlol Lodi, the governor of Dipalpur and Lahore, marched towards Delhi and succeeded in capturing the throne. Alaud-Din abandoned the throne in Bahlul's favour and died after some years at Badaun, his death marking the close of the Saiyyid dynasty.¹

It is obvious that the subjugation of Mewat could not be effected during the rule of Saiyyids and the Mewati Khanzadas indulged in all sorts of refractory activities like sheltering the rebellious chiefs, inviting powerful chiefs for help and extending their sphere of influence, whenever they got the slightest opportunity.

Mewar:

It has been related earlier that the energies of the Saiyyid rulers were confined to Mewat principality only so far as Rajasthan was concerned. We know only one solitary instance when Saiyyid Khizr Khan had proceeded as far as Nagaur.² The interior of Rajasthan practically remained undisturbed from the invasions of the Saiyyid Sultans of Delhi. This gave a free hand to the Mewar rulers to extend their power and prestige. The first half of the fifteenth century, therefore, was a period of uninterrupted succession of the Sesodia chiefs and Mewar principality reached its zenith under remarkable rulers like Maharana Kumbha (1433-68).

1. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 293-94.

2. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 186; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 267. For details see Supra, pp. 272-73.

Sidhpala.¹ These Hindus associates of Sarwar-ul Mulk, after the accession of Muhammad Shah rendered him allegiance but practically remained unmindful of his authority.²

After having reserved some Iqtas for himself, Sarwar-ul-Mulk conferred the other Parganas, including that of Bayana upon Sidhpala, Sadharan and his kinsmen.³ Meanwhile Sidhpala's slave Ran Siah proceeded towards Bayana to capture the fortress. However, when he was planning to attack the fortress, he heard about the approach of Yusuf Khan Auhadi (24th March, 1434 A.D.) in a battle that ensued, the Hindu forces were defeated and Ran Siah was killed.⁴

After Muhammad Shah's death (1443-44), Sultan Alaud-Din bin Muhammad Shah was seated on the throne of Delhi. It was perhaps due to the repeated invasions of Sultan Mubarak Shah over Mewat, that the region remained peaceful for sometime under Muhammad. Ahmad Khan Mewati came to the court of the new Sultan in 1438 to pay his obeisance.⁵

1. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 234.

2. Ibid., p. 237.

3. Ibid., p. 238; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 288. Rai Sidhpala and other Hindus were killed in an attempt to murder the Sultan.

4. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 238; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 290.

5. Yahya, T.M.S., p. 243. It is obvious that the subjugation of Mewat could not be effected during the period of the Saiyyids.

Lakshman Simha:

After the death of Kshetra Singh (1405), his eldest son Lakshman Simha succeeded to the throne and ruled up to 1421.¹

Although there was no interference in the internal affairs of Mewar by Saiyyid rulers, the kingdom throughout the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries remained at war with her neighbouring Muslim rulers of Gujarat and Malwa, who had established independent provincial Sultanates.

Lakshman Simha is said to have defeated the Sultan of Delhi near Badnor and got exemption from the pilgrimage tax, imposed on the Hindus for their visits to holy places like Kashi, Gaya and Paryag. The exemption was sought by paying huge gold coins and horses as presents by the Rana.² The principalities over which Rana is said to have won victories, included places like Badnor, (under Mers), Bundi (under Rao Vir Singh Hada), Jahaspur, Merwara, Nagrachal (Shekhawati) and the fortress of Vairat.³

1. For the Sanskrit inscription referring to Lakshman Simha see Eklinga Inscription E.I., p. 119, verse 38.

2. Ibid.

3. See Eklinga Inscription, verse 35; E.I., p. 119; Chittor Inscription, verse 38; Kumbhalgad Inscription of V.S. 1517/1460 A.D.; Shyamal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 305; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 322; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., pp. 571-72.

Lakshman Simha's rule on the whole, witnessed a general economic prosperity and cultural attainments, including construction of a number of tanks, forts and temples, some of which had been demolished earlier during the rule of Sultan Alaud-Din Khalji.¹

The marriage of the prince at an advanced age, with Rannmalla Rathor's sister Hansabai, the daughter of Rao Chunda Rathor, (1390-1442) brought the Sesodias closer to the Rathors.² Rana Mokai, who was born out of this alliance, became the successor to Mewar throne, despite the legitimate claims of Lakha's eldest son Rao Chunda Sesodia.³

Rana Kokai:

Rana Mokai succeeded to the throne of Mewar after Lakshman Simha. During Mokai's childhood, Sesodia Chunda acted as his regent. However, later on, due to Hansabai's suspicion, Rao Chunda left Mewar and took shelter with the Malwa Sultan, Hoshang Shah. With the exit of Rao Chunda Sesodia, the affairs of Mewar came to be controlled by Rannmalla and his Rathor associates.⁴

-
1. B.I., p. 98, Verse 42; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 321; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 305; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 260-62.
 2. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 15.
 3. Ibid.,; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 323.
 4. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 311-12; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 271-72.

Meanwhile, due to the family feuds among Rathors, the seat of Mandor (1410) came into possession of the Rana of Mewar and was given over to Rammalla.¹ The Rana is said to have waged successful wars against Muslim rulers of Nagaur² (Firuz Khan) and the Gujarat Sultan Ahmad Shah³ and the Rajput principalities of Bundi, Sambhar and Jalor.⁴

The king of the Yavanas, named Peroja is recorded to have been defeated by prince Mokal in a Sanskrit inscription of V.S. 1485/1428 A.D.⁵ The inscription after tracing the geneology of the Guhila princes from Arisimha to Mokal, records the latter to have defeated Peroja.⁶

Since the dates of Rana Mokal range from V.S. 1478 to 1490/1421-1433 A.D.,⁷ it is not possible that the prince

1. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 312-13.
2. E.I., Vol. II, p. 417; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 316.
3. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 13(4); Ferishta, T.E., p.
4. Chittorgarh Inscription of Rana Mokal of Mewar, Kielhorn, (ed.) E.I., Vol. II, p. 417, verse 51.
 "... यवन् नरपतिं युधिष्ठिराभिरु सेनं परोजं ।
 श्रीविजयसिंहादिवं प्रभुं नरपति-यवैर्विजयसिंहादिवः ॥ "
5. Ibid.
6. Bhandarkar's List, pp. 106-07, No. 763. Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 331. Tod erroneously states that it was Timur who was defeated by Rana Mokal.

defeated Sultan Firuz Tughluq. A possible identification of Firuz Khan may be Firuz Khan Dandani, the chief of Nagaur, who according to Kyam Khan Raso was defeated by Rana Mokai,¹ in the battle in which Kyam Khan's son Taj Khan and Muhammad Khan were also present.²

Like his father, Mokai constructed and renovated a number of temples etc., and liberally distributed gold and silver, as is mentioned in the Sringirishi and other inscriptions.³ He was assassinated by his uncles Chacha and Mera in V.S. 1490/1433 A.D.⁴

Maharana Kumbha Karna:

Maharana Kumbha succeeded his father Mokai in V.S. 1490/1433 A.D. A large number of Sanskrit inscriptions⁵ speak in high terms about the Maharana. A major part of the Maharana's reign was spent in warfare against the neighbouring kingdoms.

1. Kyam Khan Raso, text, pp. 29-30.

2. Ibid., text, p. 29.

मोकाय यल्लो परेय रवा लती है राजा
पादे आदे लुल्ल मालमल रिसार

3. Sringirishi Inscription, verse 14; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., pp. 587-88; Chittor Inscription of V.S. 1535, E.I., Vol. II, pp. 418-19.

4. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 315; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 278.

5. For details, see Ram Vallabh Somani, 'Copper Plate grant of M.Kumbha, dated V.S. 1494 from Nandia'. Maru Bharati, (July, 1968), Vol. XVI, (11), p. 53.

The first task to which the Maharana applied himself was to get Chacha and Mera assassinated. However, Chacha's son Eka and Mahpa Panwar managed to flee towards Mandu, where they took shelter with the Mandu ruler.¹

The Muslim Sultans of Malwa and Gujarat were, as would be seen, waiting for every possible chance to extend their territories, for which purpose they entered into an alliance against their common foe that is the Mewar ruler Maharana Kumbha.

As a result of the growing power of Mewar, the Sultan of Malwa could hardly contemplate an aggressive attitude towards Mewar then in possession of Rana Mokal, the youngest son of Lakshman Simha. After Lakshman's death, when young Mokal succeeded to the throne, Chunda (Sesodia) looked after the affairs of the state. The latter, however, had to vacate the place owing to his differences with his step mother Hansabai, who suspected Chunda's intentions.²

Rao Chunda found an easy refuge with the Malwa Sultan Hoshang Shah (1406-34) and the latter not only extended a cordial reception to him but even allotted him some land for maintenance.³ This has been referred to as a political

1. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 319.

2. Ibid., p. 311; Tod, Annals, Vol. I, pp. 324-25.

3. Ibid., p. 311; Ibid., p. 224.

far-sightedness on the part of the Malwa Sultan, who succeeded in creating a 'Rajput buffer against Chittor'.¹

The Ghuri dynasty of Malwa, however, was soon superseded by the Khaljis. The short rule of the last Ghuri ruler Ghazni Khan entitled Muhammad Ghuri (1435-1436) encouraged the Rajputs of Harauti, to assert their independence by invading certain territories of Malwa.²

During this period, Mahmud Khan (Khalji) controlled the affairs of the state and later on he succeeded in securing the throne for himself (1436) after poisoning Sultan Muhammad Ghuri.³

With the accession of Kumbha over Mewar and Mahmud Khalji over Malwa, the situation however, changed. Both the chiefs were over-ambitious and before a final contest for supremacy, each of them desired to curb the sphere of influence of the other by subjugating the territories lying on the Malwa-Mewar border. Neither of them risked a direct invasion at the initial stage.

The reasons of the unavoidable clash primarily lay in three fold circumstances. First, Sesodias had all along been very busy to assert his supremacy over the border

1. U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 65.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

3. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. III, p. 309;
 Ferishta, T.E., Vol. II, p. 471.

principalities of Harauti and Daur¹ etc., to gain an upper hand over his rival Muslim kingdom. Secondly, as already stated, Kumbha demanded Mahapa Panwar back from the Sultan Mahmud,² and this gave the Maharana an easy excuse to adopt an aggressive role. Sultan Mahmud, however, could not afford to risk a war at least during the first five years of his reign, because of his other rival Sultan of Gujarat who was keen to take advantage of the situation.³

The immediate reason, perhaps, lay in family feuds. Khem Karana, the Rana's brother, who was not satisfied with the fief assigned to him, forcibly occupied Bari Sadari.⁴ This resulted in his expulsion from the territory of Mewar. Khem Karana however, found a safe shelter with the Malwa Sultan, probably by 1441,⁵ since the latter was also his brother's foe. Khem Karana in alliance with the Sultan continued to be a source of trouble throughout the Rana's life.

The circumstances were now ripe for Sultan Mahmud to invade Chittor, since he not only got active assistance

1. Supra, pp. 257-58.

2. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 320; H.B. Sarda, Maharana Kumbha, p. 51. Similarly Rana is also told to have given shelter to Shahzada Umar Khan son of Sultan Hoshang Shah and thus interfered in the internal affairs of Malwa. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 327.

2. U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 170.

3. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. II, p. 1053; Nainsi, H.K., Vol. I, p. 93.

4. U.N.Dey, op.cit., p. 171.

from Khen Karana,¹ but was also free from the side of Gujarat owing to the death of Ahmad Shah.

Battle at Sarangpur:

The Rajput accounts boast of a complete victory over Sultan Mahmud in the battle that was fought at Sarangpur.² It is however, difficult to say that either of the parties won a complete victory.

Initially the Sultan started (1442) via Sarangpur and then turned towards Kilwara,³ which was a stronghold belonging to Maharana Kumbha. Next the Sultan crossed Bitan⁴ and reached Machhinderpur fort, which is probably the present Kumbhalmer.⁵ The temple of Ban Mata noted for its fortifications was defended by Dip Singh for a week but was ultimately occupied by the Malwa forces.⁶ The Sultan's forces next marched to Pankara and sacked the place. The

1. G.H.Ojha, H.R.I., Vol. I, p.

2. Ranakpur Inscription, R.I., p. 114.
According to Rajput version, in the severe battle that was fought at Sarangpur, Sultan was defeated and imprisoned by Rana. After about 6 months' imprisonment he was released unconditionally. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, fl. 127 (b), cited in U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, p. 173. It lies about 2 miles south of Kumbhalgadh.

3. Ibid., folio, 128 (b)

4. U.N.Dey, op.cit., pp. 173-74.

5. Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, pp. 324-25.

6. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, folio 130 (a).

forces now proceeded towards Chittor and ravaged Chaumuha. Here a night attack was led by Maharana (April, 1443), which, however, was repulsed by Mahmud's forces.¹ No decisive victory was thus gained by either side and the Sultan is reported to have returned to his capital, declaring that he would invade Chittor next year.²

It would thus be seen that all the invasions down to the middle to the fifteenth century were indecisive in nature and the Muslim forces could do no better than plundering some portions of the Mewar principality. The drawn wars were claimed as victories by both the sides, who commemorated these victories by erecting victory towers at Chittor and Mandu respectively. Mahmud followed a policy of weakening the position of the Rana by devastating his principalities.

Marwar:

Like Mewar another state which became prominent during the period under review, was that of the Rathor State of Marwar.³ From its foundation by Rao Siha Ji during the last quarter of the thirteenth century to Rao Chunda, the history of Marwar was a period of struggle for existence.

1. Mathir-i-Mahmud Shahi, folio, 130 (a).
Cf. U.N. Day, Medieval Malwa, p. 175.

2. Perishta, T.E., Vol. II, p. 488.

3. For establishment and early history of the Rathors of Marwar, see Supra, pp. 213-218.

During this period most of the Rathor chiefs died in a bid to keep their territories intact.¹

Rao Chunda:

Like his other Rajput and the Muslim neighbours, the principality of Marwar took full advantage of the weak Saiyyid rulers. Rao Chunda who occupied the throne by the close of the fourteenth century, availed of every possible chance to extend his hold over the adjoining territories. The Rajput accounts refer to his early career as that of a free-booter. This was during the period when he held the fief of village Salodi.²

Immediately after his accession Rao Chunda with the help of Idar Parihars, captured Mandor,³ which was then

1. For details see M.S.Ahluwalia, 'Marwar and the Sultans of Delhi', Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress, Jaipur, 1968, pp. 51-54.
2. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 59.
3. Nainsi, (N.K., Vol. II, pp. 308-09), states that the Muslim official demanded grazing grass from the Idar Parihars who were living in the adjoining region. The Parihars, thinking it as an insult, attacked the Muslim garrison in disguise of the soldiers and expelled the Muslims from Mandor. The Rathor occupation of Mandor is known from the following couplet:

३६२१ ३५८८, १११४४ १८ ११११ ११ १
 ११११ ११११ १११ ११ ११११ ११११ ११

B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 60-61.

under a Mandu governor. Mandor was possibly occupied in V.S. 1451/1394 A.D.¹ This is known from an inscription of the above date found from village Chawanda (about 7 miles from Jodhpur), where Rao Chunda built a temple known after his family diety Chamunda.²

Soon, however, the expansionist designs of Rao Chunda, engaged the attention of the governor of Gujarat Zafar Khan, who according to Mirat-i-Sikandari,³ besieged Mandor fort in A.H. 798/1396 A.D. He could not possess the fortress even after a prolonged siege and returned after accepting nominal acknowledgement of Rao Chunda.

The invasion of Timur gave a further lease to Rao Chunda who now occupied other Muslim strongholds like Nagaur (1399), Khatu, Didwana, Sambhar, Ajmer (1405) and Nadol.⁴ The principality of Nagaur, however, remained a bone of contention between the Rathors and the Muslims and the

1. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 61, fn.4.

2. Ibid.

3. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 33. The name in the chronicle is wrongly written as Mandu. Mandu was already under Muslim possession.

4. The victories of Rana Kumbha enlisted in Ranakpur inscription of V.S. 1496/1439 A.D., included Sarangpur, Nagaur, Gagraun, Naraina, Ajmer, Mandor, Mandalgadh, Bundi, Khatu, Chatsu etc. However, the credit of these victories goes to Rammalla and his Rathor followers, since Kumbha was hardly 12 or 13 years at the time of the date of inscription. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 34.

subsequent events show that it frequently changed hands between the two.¹

Nagaur was recaptured (1408) by the Gujarat Sultan Muzaffar Shah I,² with the help of Shams Khan, who possibly retained it till 1416, when it was recovered by Khizr Khan. The place was, however, regained by Rathor chief in 1421, when it was held by Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan.

Nagaur was however, not destined to remain permanently a Rathor possession. Sometime afterwards Salim (probably a Muslim governor of Multan on behalf of the Saiyyids) invaded Nagaur with the help of Sankhla of Janglu³ and Bhatia of Jaisalmer.⁴ In the battle that ensued Rao Chunda was killed.⁵

Rao Kumbha Rathor:

The struggle for the possession of Nagaur continued during the short rule of the successor of Chunda. Firstly Pimpala Sankhla of Janglu region who had been ravaging

1. Hainsi, N.K., tr., Vol. II, pp. 310-11;
Bankedas Khyat, p. 6.

2. Mirat-i-Sikandari, p. 33.

3. Janglu lies 25 miles north of Nagaur.

4. Hainsi, N.K., Vol. I, p. 313; Bankedas Khyat, Vol. I, p. 6; Tod, Annals, Vol. II, pp. 845, 733. Tod wrongly assigns the death of Rao Chunda in 1419. An inscription of 1421 referring to Rao Chunda is extant. For inscription, see B.N. Rau, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 65-66, fn. 2, 3.

5. Hainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 315.

territories, was put to rest. Kanha's efforts to regain Nagaur, however, failed, since Shams Khan's son Firuz along with some other refractories, invaded and occupied Nagaur. As a result of this the Rathor chief retreated to Mandor, his original seat.¹

Rao Satta, the next successor, was soon ousted by Rannmalla, (who had been living at Mewar) in a battle at Mandor in 1427. Satta and his son Narbad consequently retired to Mewar and were granted a fief by Rana Mokai.²

Rannmalla Rathor:

Rannmalla the eldest son of Rao Chunda had been living with Rana Lakshman Simha of Mewar. During his stay at Mewar he captured Ajmer for Rana Lakshman Simha³ and married his sister Hansabai to the Rana.⁴ The Rathor-Sesodia alliance thus proved beneficial for the time being for both powers. Rannmalla is said to have defeated the Muslim forces a number of times during his stay at Mewar.

Rannmalla continued to control the affairs of Mewar even after the succession of Rana Mokai - a product of the

1. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 68.

2. Ibid., p. 70.

3. Ibid., p. 71.

4. Bankedas Khyat, p. 6.

Mewar-Marwar alliance. The conquests of Ranmalla included Rajput territories of Nadol, (under Sonigara Chauhans), Jaisalmer (under Bhatias), Jaitran (under Sindhal Rathors), Sojat (from Hulas), Mandor (under his brother Satta).¹

Apart from his own battles listed above which continued till 1428, Ranmalla continued to assist Mokal in Mewar administration and is said to have captured Siwalak, Jalor, Sambhar, Jahaspur etc., on behalf of the Sesodia Rana.²

Ranmalla led a second invasion against Jaisalmer in 1430 and Maharawal Lakshman Simha Bhati purchased peace by marrying his daughter to him.³

During Ranmalla's reign, Jalor was in possession of Hasan Khan Pathan. The latter seems to have interfered in the territories belonging to Rao Ranmalla, as a result of which Rao despatched Rathor Uda against him. Hasan resisted for sometime but eventually concluded a treaty due to shortage of food supply.⁴

Ranmalla played a significant role in so far as the new Mewar-Marwar alliance was concerned. Chacha and Mera

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 331, 336, 343;
Bankedas Khyat, p. 7.

2. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, pp. 72-73.

3. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, p. 336.

4. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 75.

the murderers of Rana Mokai were put to death by Rannalla after a hot chase for about six months.¹ Mahpa Panwar, however, escaped and took shelter with Mahmud Khalji,² the Sultan of Mandu.

Rannalla, accordingly sent a message to the Sultan to return the fugitives. When he did not receive an affirmative reply, he attacked Mandu with the combined forces of Mewar and Marwar in V.S. 1534/1537 A.D. The consequences of the battle fought at Sarangpur have already been narrated in the history of Mewar.³

The influential position which Rannalla enjoyed for a long period in Mewar politics, however, ultimately turned against him. Chacha's son Ala and Mahpa Panwar returned to Chittor and won over the confidence of Rana Kumbha.⁴ The latter acting on their instructions, treacherously murdered Rana Rannalla Rathor in 1495/1438 A.D.⁵

1. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 337-39.

2. B.N.Reu, Marwar ka Itihas, Vol. I, p. 76.

3. See Supra, pp. 287-88.

4. Nainsi, N.K., Vol. II, pp. 339-41.

5. Ibid.; Bankedās Khyat, p. 7; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I, p. 325 date the event in V.S. 1500/1443 A.D. Tod & Suryamal also refer the assassination of Rannalla during Mokai's period. (Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 332 and Vamsa bhaskar, Vol. III, p. 1872 respectively). Ranakpur Jaina Temple Inscription dated V.S. 1496/1439 A.D. shows that Mandor must have been captured by Kumbha before this date. A.S.I., 1907-08, p. 214.

With the assassination of Rannmalla, the temporary foundation of Mewar and Marwar union¹ received a terrible blow. The Rathors under Jodha were compelled to start a struggle for regaining their ancestral territories from the Sesodia hold but their efforts did not succeed before the second half of the fifteenth century.

*

1. For Mewar-Marwar alliance in 15th century see also B.N.Reu, Glories of Marwar and the Glorious Rathors, (Jodhpur, 1943), pp. 183-85.

CHAPTER * XIII

LODĠIS AND RAJASTHAN

Sultan Bahlul Lodi:

As we have seen, the Saiyyid influence within Rajasthan did not reach beyond the borders of the Mewat and at the most beyond Nagaur and Ranthambhor. The situation practically remained the same under the rule of Lodis.

Bayana had become independent after Timur's invasion under its founder Shams Khan son of Auhad Khan.¹ He was succeeded by Mubarak Khan, Kaimul Mulk and Muhammad Khan all of whom, through warfare and diplomacy gradually consolidated their position under the Saiyyids.²

During Sultan Muhammad Shah, the small Muslim principality was held by Daud Khan Auhadi.³ Daud Khan and his successor Ahmad Khan Jalwani took full advantage of the

1. M.S.Ahluwalia, Studies in Medieval Rajasthan History, pp. 46-50.

2. Nizamutullah, M.A., tr., N.B.Roy, p. 42, fn.1.

3. Daud Khan Auhadi, according to Nizamud-Din Ahmad, I.A., Vol. I, p. 297. He was probably succeeded by Ahmad Khan Jalwani. Nizamutullah, M.A., tr., p. 42, fn. 1.

Lodi-Sharqi¹ conflicts and further strengthened their position.

After the first defeat of his rival Sharqi Sultan Mahmud (1451) Bahlul's position became secure. Sometime after this, the Sultan proceeded to Mewat and seized seven parganas from Ahmad Khan. The Sultan, however confirmed over him the remaining parganas of his territory and the latter as a token of his submission, sent his uncle Mubarak Khan as a hostage to the Sultan's court.²

After the conclusion of three years peace treaty with the Sharqi ruler Husain, Sultan Bahlul marched against Ahmad Khan Mewati, since the latter had assisted the Sharqi ruler in his war against Bahlul Lodi. On reaching Mewat, Khan-i-Khana, one of Bahlul's leading Amirs, placated Ahmad Khan and brought him before the Sultan. During this period Ahmad Khan Jalwani son of Yusuf Khan, Hakim (governor)

-
1. Ibrahim Sharqi one of the outstanding rulers of Sharqi dynasty tried to lay his hands on Bayana, although without any success. A.B. Pandey, First Afghan Empire in India, (Allahabad, 1956), p. 69. His successor Husain Sharqi partly succeeded in detaching Ahmad Khan Jalwani from allegiance to Sultan Bahlul Lodi. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 308; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 308.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., text, Vol. I, p. 146; tr., p. 36; Abdullah, T.D., p. 16; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 302; Yadgar, T.S.A., text, p. 10.

of Bayana rebelled and took the side of Sultan Husain Sharqi by reading the Khutba in his name.¹

Bayana :

Bayana had continued to be held in an independent capacity at least up to the beginning of Lodi rule. This is confirmed by a bilingual inscription of A.H. 850/1446 A.D. found in Bayana which consists of one line in Persian at the top followed by nine lines of Nagri below. The name of Ali Muhammad Khan is readable in both the scripts.²

Muhammad Khan, was succeeded by his son Daud Khan, sometime after the date of the above inscription.³ He held Bayana at least for a decade.

During the rule of Sultan Bahlul Lodi, Bayana continued to be held by Daud Khan.⁴ An undated inscription refers to the name of Daud Khan and also the construction of a minar during the reign of Nasirud-Dunya Wad-Din

-
1. Nihawandi, M.A., Vol. I, p. 446.
 2. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 79, pl. xvii.
 3. Daud Khan's rule is fortunately confirmed by a Jaina Prasasti which gives the name of the ruler and his principality

Tejapala Sambhavacharita,
Jaina Prasasti Sangrah, (Delhi, 1963), text, p. 51.

4. Nizamulla, M.A., text, p. 135.

Muhammad Shah.¹ If the above Sultan is to be identified as Sharqi ruler of the same name, it would be convenient to suppose A.H. 861 as the last date of Daud Khan.

Although it is not known as to who held Bayana after this date and in what capacity, it seems that Bayana passed into the hands of Lodi rulers. In A.H. 878, Bahlul Lodi offered to cede Bayana to the Malwa ruler Muhammad Khalji as a price of his assistance during the advance of Sultan Husain Sharqi against him.²

The Lodis continued to maintain control over some strong points in Mewat. Thus a Persian inscription from Alwar suggests that the region was under the control of Lodis. The inscription records the reconstruction of the fort and gate of the town of Naugawa (Alwar), built in the reign of Bahlul Shah, during the governorship of 'Mashad-i-Ali', Atawal Khan by Jalal son of Zakariyya. The work was begun

-
1. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 84-85. It is difficult to identify the name of the ruling Sultan Nasirud-Din Muhammad Shah of this inscription. One Nasirud-Din otherwise known as Sultan Firuz Shah died in A.H. 796. In A.H. 861 one Muhammad Sharqi, Sultan of Jaunpur was actually ruling. (Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 66-67). Although his title is not known from the close association of the Auhadi chiefs with Jaunpur ruler (Yahya, T.M.S., text, pp. 200, 209-10) may lead us to suppose A.H. 861 as the last date of this Auhadi chief.
 2. Yahya, T.M.S., text, p. 210. For details, see also M.S. Ahluwalia, 'Bayana during the Sultanate of Delhi', Studies in Medieval Rajasthan History, pp. 48-49.

on 22nd Zil-Qada and completed in the month of Muharrem, A.H. 888/February-March 1483 A.D.¹ Although nothing is known about Jalal, it seems that he held the charge of the town in some authoritative capacity. The governor too, namely Alawal Khan,² because of the title of 'Masnad-i-Ali' prefixed to his name shows that he held a high status among the nobility of Bahlul Shah.

Bahlul Lodi and the
Rana of Udaipur :

Apart from Bahlul's wars against the Rajput principalities of Gwalior³ and middle-Doab⁴, Yadgar refers to Sultan's battle with the Rana of Mewar.

1. ... این عبارت. حصہ و دروازہ قصبہ نوگاتوہ کہ ... در عہد دولت بھلول شاہ سدھان در محل
والی و دریت سندھالی عہد و گمان ... بھلول دکرہ احمد بھلول ... مرتب شد در ماہ محرم
سنہ ۸۸۸ ثانیہ

Z.A.Desai, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 53-54. The editor of the above epigraph further reports that the Hindu version of this inscription is to be found on a slab with Jaina temple at Nauganwa itself which is dated V.S. 1538. Ibid., p. 54, fn.1

2. For one Alawal Khan of the Khanzada family, see Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 120.
3. Niamatullah, M.A., text, Vol.I, p. 156; tr., p. 42.
4. The contemporaries of Bahlul over the principality of Gwalior were Kirti Singh (1455-1479), Kalyan Singh, (1479-1486) and Raja Man Singh (1486-1517). For details of the later Raja's conflicts with Delhi Sultan, see Niamatullah, M.A., text, Vol. I, p. 168; Abdullah, T.D., p. 20; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 313.; Yadgar, T.S.A., p. 17.

According to Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afaghina,¹ Sultan Bahlul proceeded against Rana and made his first halt at Ajmer. The Rana of 'Udaipur' had stationed his nephew Chhatrasal at Udaipur with 10,000 horsemen. The Sultan's commander Qutb Khan, was defeated with heavy casualties in the initial war with the Rana's commander.²

The position, however, soon changed and a desperate fight was put up by Qutb Khan and Khan-i-Khana Parmuli. Sultan's forces gained an upper hand. The Rana submitted and agreed to pay tribute. He is even reported to have issued coins and read Khutba in the name of Sultan Bahlul Lodi.³

Since Yadgar is the only Persian Chronicler giving this information, his version has been doubted as a later fabrication.⁴ The doubt mainly rests on the reference to Udaipur, which was founded much later during the rule of Akbar.

According to the Rajput traditional accounts⁵ it seems

-
1. For details about Sultan's relations with the Rajput chiefs of middle-doab, see N.B.Roy, Nisatullah's History of the Afghans, (Santiniketan, 1958), pp. 56-60.
 2. Yadgar, T.S.A., pp. 19-20.
 3. Ibid., p. 20.
 4. G.H.Ojha, H.R.I., Vol. I, p. 689, fn. 1.
 5. Tod. writes, 'He humbled himself before the king (?) of Delhi, by offering his daughter in marriage to obtain his sanction to his authority. He had scarcely quitted the Diwan Khana, on taking leave of the king, when a flash of lightening struck the Hatyara (assassin) to the earth ...'. Annals, Vol.I, p. 339.

that Sultan Bahlul probably interfered in Mewar affairs during the reign of Uda, who had occupied throne after assassination of his father Kumbha in 1486. Uda was, however, obliged to take shelter at the Delhi court and surrender the throne to the younger brother Raimalla. The Sultan perhaps supported Uda's cause. To assert the latter's claim, the Sultan might have despatched Qutb Khan and Khan-i-Khan Farmuli towards Mewar. Yadgar's version, read with the Rajput accounts may perhaps lead us to suppose that the Sultan had actually attempted to intervene in the affairs of Mewar.¹

After the conclusion of battles against Husain Sharqi,² Sultan Bahlul proceeded towards Dholpur and defeated the Raja of that principality. The Sultan then marched against Iqbal Khan, the Muslim governor of Bari.³ The governor, like the Raja of Dholpur, purchased peace by payment of several maunds of gold.⁴

-
1. N.B.Roy, Niamatullah's History of the Afghans, pp. 56-60.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 167 tr. N.B.Roy, p. 47.
 3. Bari lies 19 miles west of Dholpur town.
 4. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 167, tr. N.B.Roy, pp. 47-48; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 451; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 313; Abdullah, (T.D., text, p. 20), refers only Dholpur.

The Sultan next marched to Alhanpur,¹ which was then a dependency of Ranthambhor² and devastated the place including its orchards and trees.³

The policy adopted by Sultan Bahlul Lodi towards the Rajput chiefs in general was quite liberal. There are instances to show that Rajput chiefs of the middle-Doab, such as Rai Karan,⁴ Raja Partap,⁵ Rai Bar (Bir) Singh,⁶ Rai Tilok Chand,⁷ Rai Dhandu⁸ received royal favours and were granted fiefs.

1. Alhanpur, a Mahal in Bayana Sarkar during Akbar's rule. Abul Fazl, *A.A.*, tr., Jarrett, Vol. II, p. 274; Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, text, Vol. I, p. 167, fn. 3; Nihawandi, *M.R.*, text, Vol. I, p. 451, does not refer to Alhanpur and refers to Ranthambhor only.
2. Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, Vol. I, p. 167.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
4. Bahlul granted Shamsabad to Rai Karan, after wresting it from Juna Khan. Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, tr., p. 41.
5. *Ibid.*, Raja Partap and Rai Karan are enlisted among the nobles of the Sultan. Ahmad, *T.A.*, Vol. I, p. 299.
6. The Sultan conferred upon Bir Singh son of Raja Partap, the kettledrum and standard, captured from Darya Khan. Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, tr., p. 41; Ahmad, *T.A.*, p. 307.
7. Rai Tilok Chand of Kalpi assisted Bahlul during his war against Sultan Hussain Sharqi. Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, tr., p. 46; Abdullah, *T.D.*, p. 20.
8. Sultan conferred a few parganas of Etawah to Rai Dhandu and his son as compensation. Nizamutullah, *M.A.*, Vol. I, pp. 163, 168, tr., pp. 46, 48. Nihawandi, *M.R.*, Vol. I, p. 451.

Sikandar Lodi:

Sultan Sikandar Lodi who ascended the throne of Delhi on 17-18th Shaban, A.H. 894/16-17 July, 1489 A.D.¹ inherited apart from Delhi parts of eastern Rajasthan, east and west Panjab and parts of modern Uttar Pradesh. The Sultan appears to have further consolidated his position by leading his forces against most of the independent Rajasthan principalities including those of Dholpur, Nagaur, Bayana, Mewat, Mandrail, Ranthambhor and Avantgarh, apart from the Rajput territories of Gwalior and middle Doab.

Bayana and Mewat:

Sometime before 1492 Sultan Sharf² son of Ahmad Khan Jalwani, the governor of Bayana assumed an independent status and detached himself from paying allegiance to the Sultan of Delhi.³

With the accession of Sultan Sikandar Lodi, Sultan Sharf expected the Sultan to allow him to retain the principality of Bayana but sikandar was determined to allow

-
1. Nizamud-Din, T.A., Vol. I, p. 316. He caused the Khutba to be read in the name of Sharqi Sultan instead of Sultan Bahlul Lodi. See Nizamutullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 156, tr., p. 42.
 2. Nizamud-Din, T.A., Vol. I, p. 314; Yadgar, T.S.A., pp. 34-36; Abdullah, T.D., pp. 34-36; Nizamutullah, M.A., text, p. 174.
 3. Nizamud-Din, T.A., Vol. I, p. 316.

him no scope for mischief in the future.¹

Sultan Sharf who thus waited on the Sultan in a hope to retain his possession, was ordered to surrender the principality of Bayana.²

He was to be compensated with the principalities of Chandwar and Sakit.³ Umar Khan Sherwani was instructed to take over the charge of Bayana. However, Sharf soon after reaching Bayana changed his mind and determined to stand a siege. When informed about these developments, Sikandar marched personally to Bayana and succeeded in defeating Sultan Sharf.⁴

After its capture, Bayana was entrusted to Khan-i-Khana Farmuli⁵ in A.H. 897/1491-92 A.D.⁶ whereupon

1. A.b.Pandey, First Afghan Empire in India p. 120 and K.S.Lal, Twilight of Sultanate, p. 167.
2. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 316; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 455; Nismatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 174, tr., p. 72.
3. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 174, tr., p. 72; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 316; Cf. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 455.
4. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 316; Nismatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 316, tr., p. 72.
5. The name of the Khan-i-Khana Formuli is mentioned in two later inscriptions. One is in Sanskrit dated V.S. 1553/1496 A.D. (Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, pp. 87-88) and the second is of A.H. 926/1494 A.D. (ibid). Both of them were found in the fort of Vijaymandirgarh in Bayana. Both these inscriptions record Khan-i-Khana as the governor of the place.
6. Nismatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 174; tr., p. 72; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 455; Ferishta, T.E., Vol. I, p. 180; Cf. Yadgar, T.S.A., p. 37.

Sultan Sharf proceeded towards Gwalior and possibly found refuge with the chief of that place. After the death of Khan-i-Khana Farmuli, Bayana remained for some period under his sons Imad and Sulaiman. But the Sultan ousted them and appointed Safdar Khan, Amil of Agra, which was then under Bayana.¹

Bayana with its dependencies of Bari and Thangir, seems to have remained under Sultan Sikandar till his death. Sometime before 1517, the pargana of Bari was taken away from the sons of Mubarak Khan and given over to Shaikhzada Makhan.²

During the first decade of the sixteenth century, Sultan Sikandar actively engaged himself in curbing the disturbing elements in the various principalities of Rajasthan, like Dholpur, Mandrail, Avantgarh, Ranthambhor and Nagaur. It may be noted that the invasion of the places lying in the eastern Rajasthan viz Dholpur, Mandrail, and Avantgarh, was a part of Sultan's major operation against

1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 80-81.
tr., p. 81;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 324.

2. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 334.

refractory Tomara kingdom of Gwalior.¹

Dholpur:

The growing refractory elements of the Tomaras of Gwalior compelled the Sultan to attempt to reduce the principality to submission. It was first decided to annex Dholpur,² which was a dependency of Gwalior and was governed by Raja Vinayak Deva.³

Sultan Sikandar accordingly, despatched some of his best commanders like Alam Khan Mewati, Khan-i-Khana Nuhanai and Khawas Khan to occupy the principality of Dholpur.⁴ In

-
1. Gwalior remained a Muslim possession since its capture by Sultan Iltutmish. It, however, asserted independence under Vir Singh, a Tomara Rajput after Timur's invasion. The principality continued to grow in strength in spite of the pressure by Saiyyids and the Lodis, as well as the provincial Muslim kingdoms of Malwa and Jaunpur etc. Some of the rulers of Gwalior, Dungar Singh, Kirti Singh, Kalyan Singh, not only kept their principality intact but even made attempts to extend their hold by invading territories under the principality of Malwa. The contemporary of Sultan Sikandar Lodi on the Gwalior throne was Raja Man Singh (1486-1517) who reportedly sheltered the Afghan rebels. For details about Gwalior and its rulers, see Cunningham, *A.S.I.*, Vol. II, pp. 330-60.
 2. Dholpur lies 24 miles south of Agra and 37 miles north west of Gwalior. Hunter, *Imperial Gazetteer*, Vol. IV, p. 273.
 3. Niamatullah, *M.A.*, Vol. I, p. 192; Ahmad, *T.A.*, Vol. I, p. 324.
 4. Niamatullah, *M.A.*, Vol. I, pp. 191-92, tr., p. 82; Nihawandi, *M.R.*, Vol. I, p. 463; Ahmad, *T.A.*, Vol. I, p. 324.

the preliminary conflict the Muslim forces suffered reverses and Khwaja Ben, one of the most gallant warriors, lost his life in the battle.¹

The Sultan having received the news of these reverses personally proceeded towards Dholpur on 6th Ramzan, A.H. 906/26th March, 1501.² The raja of Dholpur put up resistance for a few days but ultimately yielded and vacated the fortress which was occupied by the royal troops.

The Sultan is reported to have ordered his forces to indulge in loot and plunder including the destruction of the temples.³ After its capture, Dholpur was entrusted to Adam Lodi⁴ and a garrison was left there to assist Adam Lodi. The Sultan after this proceeded towards Gwalior his main target.

The Raja of Dholpur seems to have carried on the resistance, with the aid of his over-lord, Raja Man Singh. The subsequent events suggest that during his march to Gwalior, the Sultan's forces, during their stay at the banks

1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 192; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 463; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 324.

2. Ibid.

3. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 192-93, tr., p. 82; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 324; Abdullah, T.D., p. 60; Mansir-i-Rahimi, Vol. I, p. 463.

4. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 193, tr., p. 82; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 463; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 324.

of river Mendki,¹ suffered heavy losses because of the spread of an epidemic through polluted water. The Raja of Gwalior took advantage of the situation and offered the Sultan to return his fugitives provided Vinayak Deva was reinstated over Dholpur. To this the Sultan readily agreed.² The subsequent history shows that the Sultan, after his return from Gwalior restored the principality of Dholpur to his original occupant Raja Vinayak Deva.³

Its annexation was possible only after the foundation of Agra (1505) as his headquarters, from where the Sultan led an effective invasion and captured Dholpur which was placed under the charge of Qamarud-Din.⁴

On 20th Muharram, A.H. 913/9th June, 1507 A.D.,⁵ the Sultan is again reported to have started for Agra via Dholpur. While passing through the latter place, the Sultan's forces suffered heavy losses due to scarcity of

-
1. Identified with modern Asun, flowing west of Gwalior. See K.S.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 175, fn. 71.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 193; Ferishta, T.F., Vol. I, p. 183; K.S.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 175.
 3. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 193, tr., p. 83; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 464; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 326.
 4. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 464; Cf. Niamatullah, M.A., text, Vol. I, p. 196, tr., p. 84.
 5. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 328, Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 465.

water and narrow defiles which resulted in the death of more than 800 soldiers.¹ It is difficult to state Raja Vinayak Deva's attitude during this catastrophe on the Sultan and his troops, but it seems certain that Dholpur remained under the Sultan till his death and sometime before his death he visited this place.²

Mandrail:

The capture of Dholpur made it easier for the Sultan to use the place as his headquarters for his further operations against the other territories under the Raja of Gwalior. The operation against Mandrail³ (about 12 miles south east of Karauli town) was a part of Sultan's bigger operation against Gwalior.

From Dholpur, the Sultan sent advance parties against Mandrail and Gwalior in Ramzan, A.H. 910/February 1506 A.D.⁴ The Sultan is reported to have indulged in devastating the territory, destroying the temples and building mosques in

-
1. Abdullah, T.A., p. 61; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 328; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 197.
 2. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 219, tr., p. 91; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 334, Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 473.
 3. It is situated on a round hill about 2 miles distance from the western bank of river Chambal. K.S.Lal, Twilight of the Sultanate, p. 175, fn. 74; Abul Fasl, Ain-i-Akbari, calls it Mandlair, tr., Jarrett. Vol. II, p. 190.
 4. Nizamutullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 194, tr., p. 83; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 325.

their places.¹ After its capture, Mandrail fort was entrusted to the charge of Mian Makhan and the Sultan himself returned to the capital after a short stay at Dholpur.²

The next year, the Sultan again started towards Gwalior and after staying at Dholpur for over a month, he proceeded further and encamped at Chambal for several months. The Sultan, however, did not succeed in bringing the Tomara principality to subjugation.³

The failure of Sultan Sikandar against Gwalior perhaps induced him to lay his hands on the neighbouring principalities and the dependencies of Gwalior. One such was the fortress of Avantgarh,⁴ lying about 28 miles south west of Karauli.⁵ It was a stone fort overlooking river

1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 194, tr., p. 83; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 325.

2. Ibid.

3. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 197, tr., p. 84.

4. Avantgarh lies between Harwar and Gwalior at the southern mouth of Pannar Pass, 26°6' north and 77°0' east. Its name has been variously spelt as Himatgarh, Udentigir, Thankar, Utgir, Awaintgarh, Hanwantgarh, Avantagar, and Uditnagar etc. See Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. II, pp. 328-30; Abul Fasl, A.A., Vol. I, p. 190; Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 199; Nihavandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 466, which is very close to its modern name Utgarh. Niamatullah, M.A., p. 83, fn. 2.

5. According to Ferishta, the Sultan considered Avantgarh as the key to the reduction of Gwalior. T.F., text, p. 184.

Chambal.¹

From Dholpur, where the Sultan had his first halt, he despatched Imad Khan and Mujahid Khan with 10,000 horse and about 100 elephants.² After receiving reports, the Sultan left Mujahid Khan at Dholpur and himself proceeded at an auspicious hour, indicated by the astrologers,³ towards Awantgarh across the Chambal and reached there on 23rd Ramzan, A.H. 912/6th February, 1507 A.D.⁴

The well equipped army of the Sultan was directed to leave no stone unturned for the reduction of the fort. The royal troops, according to Niamatullah, surrounded the fort from all sides, like ants and locusts.⁵

A tough resistance was offered by the inhabitants of the garrison. The fortress, however, was reduced after a breach was made in the fortress wall. The Rajputs, as a last resort, preferred to destroy their property in the flames of fire by performing Jauhar.⁶

-
1. Abul Fazl, A.A., Vol. II, p. 91.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 199, tr., p. 85.
 3. Ibid.; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 327.
 4. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 200, tr., p. 85; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 327.
 5. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 200-201, tr., p. 86; Nihavandi, M.R., Vol. I, pp. 466-67.
 6. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 201, tr., p. 86; Nihavandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 467; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 327.

The losses on the Sultan's side were equally heavy. Malik Alaüd-Din, one of the ablest commanders, lost his one eye, while he was busy making a breach in the fortress wall.¹

The Sultan enraged at the losses of the royal troops, is reported to have showed no mercy to the inhabitants of the fort as well as the fort itself. He entrusted the fort to Mian Makhan and Mujahid Khan² with instructions for a general massacre and the destruction of the temples in the vicinity.³

Soon reports reached about the Raja⁴ having bribed Mujahid Khan to divert King from invading the principality.⁵ The Sultan could hardly tolerate such a move and immediately sent orders to the nobles stationed at Dholpur to arrest Mujahid Khan. Mulla Jumman, another follower of

1. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 467.

2. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 328. Ferishta writes, Bhikan son of Mujahid Khan. T.F., text, p.

3. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 201, tr., p. 86; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, pp. 466-67; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 327-28; Badauni, M.T., Vol. I, p. 320.

4. His name is given as Rai Dungar or Udai Karan is reported to have converted to Islam under the name of Hasan Khan. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 331-32; Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. , tr., pp. 90-91.

5. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 201, tr., 86.; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 328.

Mujahid Khan was imprisoned and put under the custody of Malik Tajud-Din¹ on 15-16th Muharram, A.H. 913/28th May, 1507 A.D.²

Awantgarh was most probably a dependency of Gwalior. The place was used as a state prison after the capture of Marwar (1507-08), when Sultan Sikandar Lodi confined his brother there. Two years later another attempt was made by the Rajputs to recover Awantgarh. Sultan Sikandar Lodi ordered Sulaiman Khan Farmuli, the governor of Dholpur to march in aid of Hasan Khan, the governor of the fort.³ Husain Khan was a converted Rajput⁴ and probably belonged to the Gwalior house.⁵ Sulaiman, however, excused himself under the plea that he did not want to be away from the Sultan.⁶ The Sultan at this, transferred him to the pargana of Indri.⁷

-
1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 201; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 467.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 201, tr., p. 86; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 328.
 3. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 209, tr., pp. 90-91; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 471; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 332.
 4. According to Ahmad, original name was Rai Dungar, T.A., Vol. I, p. 232; Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 209-10.
 5. Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. II, p. 330.
 6. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 210, tr., p. 91; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 332.
 7. Ibid.; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 471.

Although the Sultan failed to annex Gwalior, he certainly met with some success in reducing its dependencies, such as listed above.

By a strange accident the principality of Nagaur came under the control of the Sultan. Sometime after 1509, Ali Khan and Abu Bakr, two of the adherents of Muhammad Khan, the governor of Nagaur, intrigued to kill the latter.¹

The governor, however, came to know of their design and decided to assassinate both for their evil designs. Before the governor could effect his scheme, both of them took shelter with the Lodi Sultan. This frightened Muhammad Khan so much that he issued coins and caused the Khutba to be read in the name of the Sultan. He also sent rich presents and pledged to remain loyal. The Sultan pleased at the unexpected developments, accepted the offer of Muhammad Khan and installed him in his principality.²

Daulat Khan, the governor of Ranthambhor, seems to have owed allegiance to the Sultan of Malwa.³ In A.H. 922/

-
1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 208-09;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 331; Nihawandi,
M.R., Vol. I, pp. 470-71.
 2. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 208-09;
Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, pp. 470-71;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 331.
 3. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, pp. 472-73;
Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 333-34.

1516 A.D., Ali Khan Nagauri, the governor of Shivpuri¹, is told to have succeeded in detaching him from paying allegiance to the Malwa Sultan. Daulat Khan being over-awed with Sultan Sikandar's power, offered allegiance to the Sultan and even invited him to Ranthambhor.

The tide, however, soon turned against the Sultan and Ali Khan Nagauri, who did not receive due favours from the Sultan, advised the prince to go back on his word². The Sultan disappointed by turn of events, was unable to do anything. Moreover, he died soon afterwards.³

As is clear from the above conflicts, a major part of Sultan Sikandar's rule was occupied against tiny Rajput and Muslim principalities on the eastern boundary of the Rajasthan.⁴ Most of these owed their allegiance to the Tomara kingdom of Gwalior.

Although the Sultan succeeded in reducing most of

1. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 333; Shivpuri, 25-40 north and 76-44 east on the right bank of river Sip. The Persian chronicles refer to it as Suispur near Awantgarh and a dependency of Gwalior.
2. Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, pp. 472-73; Ahmad, T.A., p. 334.
3. The Sultan died on Sunday 7th Zikad, A.H. 923/ 21st November, 1517 A.D., Yadgar, T.S.A., p. 64.
4. According to Yadgar, the kingdom of Sultan Sikandar Lodi extended from Jalalabad to Mandu and from Udaipur to Patna. T.S.A., p. 41.

these places such as Dholpur, Mandrail, Avantgarh and Narwar¹ which ultimately paved a way for the reduction of Gwalior under Sultan Sikandar's successor Ibrahim Lodi, the continuous warfare cost very heavily on the Sultanate resources.

A word here may be said about the Jaina traditional accounts speaking highly about Sultan Sikandar's religious tolerance.

According to Jambu Sagar, (A biography of Jambuji, V.S. 1508-1593) - the Jain monk Jasnathji, a contemporary of Jambuji, impressed upon Sikandar Lodi through his learning and piety during the latter's visit.² (to Rajasthan?)

If thus appears that the Jains enjoyed religious freedom as a result of the mutual understanding of the contemporary Jain monks with the Sultan.

1. For Sultan's invasion of Narwar, which formed a part of Malwa kingdom, see Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, pp. 205-06, tr., pp. 68-69, fn. 1; Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, pp. 328-29.

2. "जम्बू ६/५ ऐसी पर जामे
 ३५५६२ चलाये
 गये, श्री ६/५६ जम्बू
 हवे की रोजी पाये ॥"

Jambu Sagar (published V.S. 2011), 'Shabda Ilol Sagar', No. 29, pp. 319-20; Munshi Sohan Lal also writes that Sultan was not much pleased by the learning of Jasnath and granted him iqta near Malasar. Tawarikh Bikaner (Urdu), p. 45. (I am obliged to Sh. Surya Shankar Parikh of Bhartiya Vidya Mandir Shodh Pratisthan, Bikaner, for drawing my attention to Jambu Sagar).

Sultan Ibrahim Lodi:

Soon after Sultan Sikandar Lodi's death, his son Ibrahim Lodi ascended the throne on 15th Zilhijah, A.H. 923/29th December, 1517 A.D.¹ The early years of his reign were occupied against his rival Jalal Khan, his brother, who had assumed sovereign powers at Kalpi and initiated a civil war.²

Jalal Khan was actively supported by the Raja of Gwalior and when Jalal fled thither, he was sheltered by the Rajput chief. This resulted in despatch of a huge army in 1518 to Gwalior under Azam Humayun Sherwani.³

1. Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 119;
Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 481;
Abdullah, T.D., p. 108; Ahmad.,
T.A., Vol. I, p. 343.
2. For details, see T.A., Vol. I, pp. 343-44;
Niamatullah, M.A., Vol. I, p. 119;
Abdullah, T.D., pp. 107-08.
3. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. I, p. 347; Abdullah,
T.D., p. 111; Nihawandi, M.R., Vol. I, p. 483.
Fortunately for Ibrahim Lodi, both his formidable rivals, Jalal Khan and Raja Man of Gwalior had died by 1518, which made it possible for the Sultan to capture Badalgarh, one of the Sultan in the ultimate surrender of Raja Vikramaditya son of Raja Man. The Tomara chief remained loyal to the Sultan throughout his life and died fighting for him in 932 A.H./1526 A.D.

Ibrahim Lodi verses
Rana Sangram Singh:

The most notable encounter of the last Lodi Sultan Ibrahim against Rajasthan was his struggle against the Sesodia Rana Sangram Singh of Mewar.¹ Rana Sangram Singh popularly known as Rana Sanga, occupied and inherited a stable kingdom. His military career inherited a 'great military tradition.' Still unsatisfied with the principality inherited, he constantly kept himself engaged in wars with his neighbours and almost succeeded in establishing his authority over practically the whole of modern Rajasthan.

According to the Rajput accounts, he kept 80,000 horse, seven Rajas of highest rank, nine Rais, 104 chieftains, with the titles of Rawal and Rawat, with 500 war elephants, which followed him in the field.²

Apart from Sanga's conflicts with provincial Muslim

1. For early history of the Sesodias of Mewar, see Supra, pp. 46-48, 104-107, 123, 155-173, 241-44, 279-288, and 300-302.
2. Tod, Annals, Vol. I, p. 348. According to Tod, the princes of Marwar and Ambar, Rais of Gwalior, Ajmer, Sikri, Abu and Srinagar (Ajmer) served him as his tributaries. Ibid., pp. 348-49.

rulers of Malwa,¹ the Rajput accounts refer to his having taken initiative of annexing the Sultanate of Delhi itself.² The Lodi rulers, on the other hand, too were active in extending their hold over Malwa dependencies. The capture of Chanderi and Narwar belonging to Gwalior, gave them an advantageous position and a conflict with the Sesodia, who were equally ambitious, was only a matter of time.

The decaying kingdom of Malwa during the period under review, gave a favourable chance to Rana Sanga, who took up the cause of Medini Rai. The Lodis, however, could never tolerate the dominance of the Rana over Malwa. To do away with Medini Rai, Mahmud Khalji II, the ruler of Malwa sought assistance from the ruler of Gujarat. The Gujarati nobles Bohjat Khan and Muhafiz Khan on the other hand, went over to the side of Sultan Sikandar Lodi, whom Medini Rai

-
1. One of the vassal chiefs of the Sultan of Malwa was Medini Rai of Chanderi. The latter played a very vital role in Malwa history and through his power and shrewdness saved the kingdom of Malwa from internal and external dangers. However, his appointment of the Rajputs to the key posts and himself acquiring the civil and military administration aroused Malwa Sultan's suspicion who ultimately shunted him out. Medini Rai sought refuge with Rana Sanga, who took up his cause to satisfy his own lust for territorial extension. For details, see U.N.Dey, Medieval Malwa, pp.
 2. According to Tod, he fought 18 battles against the kings of Delhi and Malwa or these two were fought with the Sultan Ibrahim, at Bakrol and Ghatol. Tod., Annals, Vol. I, p. 349.

had invited to his help against these vicissitudes. Rana Sanga proved victorious in the conflict for the struggle for supremacy and succeeded in reinstating Medini Rai after defeating both the Sultans of Delhi and Gujarat.¹

The opponents of Medini Rai in a bid to oust him, sought assistance of Sultan Sikandar Lodi. Medini Rai, luckily succeeded in destroying this confederacy including those of the forces of Gujarat.² It has been suggested that Medini Rai being hard pressed by the Gujarat and the Delhi forces, might have sought the aid of Rana Sanga and the latter by attacking Lodi territory induced Sultan Sikandar to withdraw temporarily.³

Rana Sanga probably utilized the period of civil war following the death of Sikandar Lodi, in extending his hold over the adjoining principalities at the cost of Delhi Sultan. Ibrahim Lodi was busy in checking the civil war and consolidating his position when he heard about Rana Sanga's advance.⁴

-
1. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. III, pp. 383-95;
Ferishta, T.E., Vol. II, pp. 263-65.
 2. Ahmad, T.A., Vol. III, pp. 383-392;
Ferishta, T.E., Vol. II, pp. 263-65.
See also H.B.Sarda, Maharana Sanga, pp. 64-68.
 3. A.B.Pandey, First Afghan Empire in India,
p. 181; G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. II, p. 363.
 4. H.B.Sarda, Maharana Sanga, p. 56.

In the battle that was fought at Khatoli, which lies on the Haraoti borders,¹ the Rajput forces under Sanga gained a complete victory and imprisoned a prince of Lodi family.² Personally for Rana Sanga, the battle proved too disastrous. He lost his left arm and an arrow shot made him lame for ever.

A renewed effort from both the sides was inevitable. Rana had been disabled for ever and groaned for a revenge, while the Sultan was anxious to 'rehabilitate his dignity'. Again the Lodi prince who had been made a war prisoner, could be exploited as a possible rival to the throne.³

The Sultan, therefore, proceeded against the Rana in 1518 with an army consisting of many experienced commanders including Mian Husain Farmuli, Mian Maruf Farmuli, Khan-i-Khana Farmuli and Mian Makhan.⁴

The preliminary successes even in this battle lay with the Rajputs led by Sanga. This was possibly due to disaffection among the Afghan nobles. Mian Husain

1. Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi, Alig. Roto. fl. 118. Khatoli was in Gwalior Sarkar during Akbar. Abul Fazl A.A., Vol. II, tr., Jarrett, p. 187. See also G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. II, p. 663; H.B.Sarda, Maharana Sanga, p. 56.

2. Riazullah, W.M. (Alig., Mass), p. 120; Tod., Annals, Vol. I, p. 349.

3. A.B.Pandey, First Afghan Empire in India, p. 182; Yadgar, T.S.A., p. 78; Abdullah, I.D., p. 121.

4. Ibid., p. 116.

deserted to the side of the Rana. This greatly demoralised the Afghan forces who suffered a heavy defeat in that battle that was fought near Dholpur. A large number of Afghan soldiers were killed. The remaining retreated to Bayana with utmost difficulties.¹

The Sultan hearing about this defeat marched personally from Agra. Mian Husain and his followers frightened by Sultan's power rejoined the royal camp.² Although in a decisive battle the Rana retreated from the battle field for the time being, he succeeded in killing Husain, the governor of Chanderi, and seized it.

It thus appears that the last Lodi Sultan failed in his efforts to curb the power of the Sesodia Rana and the latter almost succeeded in forming a Rajput confederacy. He became a source of permanent danger to the Lodi Sultanate. By the closing years of Lodi empire, the Rana's ambitions had so greatly grown that he sent an envoy to Babur in a bid to form an alliance with him and synchronise his own attack on Agra with that of Babur on Delhi.³ For Babur, it was a most suitable offer and a favourable opportunity. He wasted no time in mobilising a strong force, invaded

1. Yadgar, T.S.A., p.81.

2. G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. II, p.66; H.B.Sarda, Maharana Sanga, p. 62.

3. Babur, B.N., tr., Beveridge, Vol. II, p. 529.

Hindustan and captured Lahore and Dipalpur.¹ (1524). Two years later Babur finally succeeded in defeating and killing Ibrahim at the battle field of Panipat,² which put an end to Lodi rule in India.

The Babur-Rajput alliance, however, did not materialize. Rana Sanga, who was equally resourceful and warlike chief could grow very dangerous. The Rana, as is well known was more ambitious in claiming supremacy. Under such circumstances Babur would prefer a less formidable rival like Lodis than Sanga.

Again it was possible for Babur to secure the support of the local Afghan chiefs at places like Rapri, Koel, Chandwar, Sambhal and Kanauj only by waging war against the Rana. Similarly, in order to secure the co-operation of the local Muslims, he was bound to give the war against the Rana, the character of a Jihad. Since Sanga was the only serious rival to the sovereignty, it could not be expected much from the so-called alliance which failed as it was bound to. In the battle of Khanwah (1527), Sanga was finally defeated, leaving the field open to Babur.

*

1. Babur, B.N., tr., Vol. I, p. 441.

2. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 472; Yadgar, T.S.A., p. 95.

CHAPTER * XIVC_O_N_C_L_U_S_I_O_N

The Turkish invasion of northern India was a long process bringing about important socio-political changes in Rajasthan. Although Rajasthan played an important and decisive role at the close of the twelfth century, it did not acquire a political identity during the period of Delhi Sultanate.

Of the several 'Rajput' clans which emerged before or during this period, many ended their political career even before the Ghorian occupation of Delhi. Some of them were liquidated by the Turkish and Khalji Sultans, whereas a few of them, taking advantage of the political conditions of the post-Timur period, re-asserted their independence and continued to play an important role in the region for several centuries to come.

Politically, the Ghorian invasions resulted in the emergence of various clans, some of which gained prominence during this period. Many old Kshatriya clans were pushed aside and brought to the forefront; other clans, like Pratiharas, Chauhans, Paramaras, Bhatias,

Solankis and Rathors, found 'scope for continued work and continuance as political units.' Some of them survived; some disappeared; whereas the importance of the rest diminished substantially.

The Ghorid invasions directly resulted in feverish military activity of the various clan chiefs designated in Persian chronicles as Rais, Ranas, Chaudhuris, Khuts and Mugaddams. Some of these titles were original whereas the others were evolved to suit the needs of the time.

The Delhi Sultans' pressure upon Rajasthan continued during the entire period under review and many important principalities such as Ajmer, Ranthambhor, Bayana, Jalor, Siwana etc., passed under their control. The Sultans succeeded in reducing most of the important principalities in a gradual process. The territories of some of the important ruling houses were annexed to Delhi, and Governors and other administrators were appointed over them as is known from Persian and Sanskrit literary as well as epigraphic sources.

The political changes in Rajasthan during the post-Timur period also resulted in the first independent Muslim ruling dynasty - the Auhadis of Bayana, who replaced the Jadon Bhatias and continued to rule independently until the coming of the Mughals.

The socio-political structure did not undergo a substantial change during the period under study. However, there are several instances when the Sultans took the Rajputs in confidence and not only left the conquered territories under their possession, but also appointed them to high posts. Similarly, Jains are reported during the Tughluq period to have not only eulogised the Sultans but also secured liberal concessions from them for pilgrimage and propagating their religion. It cannot therefore be denied that during this period there existed some 'secular elements' which formed the basis of the Mughal empire.

*

APPENDIX

A: LIST OF PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Mamluks

Sr. No.	Place	Date, contents and source
1	2	3
1.	Nagaur	<p>A.H. 595=1197-98 A.D.</p> <p>Contains only the name of the king and his kunya Abu'l-Muzaffar and title Nasir-i-Amiri'l Muminin and nisba a sh-Shihabi of a person (name lost).</p> <p><u>E.I.A.P.S.</u>, 1968, p. 3, pl. I a; <u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1965-66, No. D, 238.</p>
2.	Ajmer	<p>A.H. 595, Jumada II = April 1199 A.D.</p> <p>Contains Quranic verses</p> <p><u>E.I.M.</u>, 1911-12, p. 15, pl. XXIV.</p>
3.	Ajmer	<p>A.H. 596, Zil Hijja = September-October 1200 A.D.</p> <p>Records the name of Abu Bakr Ibn Ahmed Khalu (?) al-Hirwi as Supervisor of the construction.</p> <p><u>E.I.M.</u>, 1911-12, p. 15, pl. No. 1; <u>A.S.I.</u>, II, p. 261, pl. LXXIV; <u>J.A.S.B.</u>, XVII (1848), p. 553.</p>
4.	Bari Khatu	<p>A.H. 599, Jumadi I = January-February 1203 A.D.</p> <p>Records the date of the construction of the building.</p> <p><u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1962-63, No. D, 200.</p>

 1 2 3

5. Kaman

A.H. 600, Ramzan = May-June
 1204 A.D.

Seems to record the construction of a well, tank and the mosque (in the time of) Tughril Sultani by the great Amir (name partly lost, partly illegible). King's name etc., lost.

A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 320;
A.S.I., XX, p. 56.

6. Didwana

A.H. 606 Zil Hijja, Middle i.e.
 15 = June 1210 A.D.; A.H. 608,
 Rabi II, Middle i.e. 15 = Sept.,
 26, 1211 A.D.

States that the death of the great and learned Imam, Rashidu'd-Din Jha'u, son of Mahmud, son of Khwajagi, wal (i.e. of Sarsati) took place on the first date and that the construction of his tomb took place on the second date.

A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D. 411.

7. Bari Khatu

A.H. 629, Ramzan = June-July
 1232 A.D.

Records the construction of a tank by Mas'ud, son of Ahmad, son of 'Umar al-Khilj .

E.I.A.P.S., 1966, pp. 6-7, pl. Ib;
A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D. 170-

8. Nagaur

A.H. 631, Safar 10 = November
 15, 1233 A.D.

Slightly damaged. Record the demise of Shaikh Badru'd-Din Mika'il, son of Uthman, son of Abi Bakr Al-Jawli(?)

A.R.I.E., 1966-67, No. D. 228.

9. Nagaur
A.H. 636=1238-39 A.D.
Mostly peeled off. Records the demise of Abu-Bakr, son of Sa'du'llah.
A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 346.
10. Ladnun
A.H. 63(?) 8, Ramzan 3, Monday = March 18, 1241 A.D.
Records the death of Muhammad, son of Iqbal as-Sultan Shahi.
A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D. 418.
11. Ladnun
A.H. 638=1241 A.D.
Contains the name Muhammad, son of Iqbal Sultan Shahi.
A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D. 419.
12. Nagaur
A.H. 646=1248-49 A.D.
States that the tomb is that of Abu'l-Hasan better known as Sa'id, son of Sai'd a'sh-Shirazi.
A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 344.
13. Didwana
A.H. 650-1252 A.D.
Seems to refer to the construction of a mosque. Also mentions 'Alau'd Daulat Wa'd-Din Muhammad and Hafkharu'l-Umara (name lost).
A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D. 412.

- E.I.A.P.S., 1906, p. 17, pl. IV a;
A.R.I.E., 1962-63, No. D. 201.

Khaljis

.....
 1 2 3

18. Bari Khatu A.H. 700, Zil Hija 1=August 7, 1301 A.D.
 Contains only religious text.
A.R.I.E., 1966-67, No. D. 209.
19. Bari Khatu A.H. 702=1302-3 A.D.
 Assigns the construction of a mosque
 to Muhammad, son of Al-Fakhri.
E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 4, pl. I a;
A.R.I.E., 1962-63, No. D. 202.
20. Chittorgarh A.H. 704, Safar 8 = September
 10, 1304 A.D.
 Refers to the construction of
 some structure by Sartiz Al
 (Alp ?) Khani.
E.I.A.P.S., 1959 and 1960, p. 71,
 pl. XVIII a; A.R.I.E., 1965-66,
 No. D. 129.
21. Bayana A.H. 705, Muharram 1=July 24, 1305 A.D.
 States that the buildings of a mosque
 and well were constructed & repaired
 after they had fallen in ruins and
 decayed, by 'Abdu'l-Malik son of
 Abu-Bakr al-Bukhari entitled Mughith,
 the governor of the district.
E.I.M., 1917-18, p. 20, pl. V a;
A.S.I., XX, p. 76, pl. XIV.
22. Nagaur A.H. 706=1305-06 A.D.
 Contains only part of the name
 and the titles of the king.
E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 6, pl. V b;
A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 341.

23. Chittorgarh A.H. 709 211 Hijja 10 = May 11, 1310 A.D.
Extant portion contains an eulogy of the king and the date.
E.I.A.P.S., 1959 and 1960, p. 72, pl. XVIII b; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 126.
24. Chittorgarh (c. A.H. 715=1315-16 A.D.)
Contains a Qur'anic, verse.
E.I.A.P.S., 1959-60, p. 74, pl. XIX c; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 132.
25. Chittorgarh
Fragmentary. Extant portion contains merely the name and title of the king.
E.I.A.P.S., 1959-60, p. 74, pl. XIX b; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 130.
26. Chittorgarh
Fragmentary and damaged. Seems to refer to the erection of a Jamī' mosque on the site of a ruined temple.
E.I.A.P.S., 1959-60, p. 73, pl. XIX a; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 128.
27. Bayana
States that this 'Charitable work' (Khair) was constructed by Muhammad son of Sanqar.
E.I.M., 1917-18, p. 8, fn. 1, pl. XXIV a; A.S.I. XX, p. 70, pl. XIV.

- A.R.L.E., 1969-70, No. D. 157.**

 1 2 3

32. Nagaur

A.H. 720, Muharram=February-March,
 1320 A.D.

Seems to record the construction of
 the mosque; styles the reign of the
 king as 'Caliphate'.

E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 8, pl. II b;
A.R.I.E., 1966-66, No. D. 349.

33. Bayana

A.H. 720=1320 A.D.

Records the construction of the
 mosque by Kafur Sultani.

E.I.M., 1917-18, p. 42, pl. XIII c;
A.S.I., XX, p. 72, pl. XV, no. 1.

Tughluqs

34. Jalor

A.H. 723, Shaban 1=August 5,
 1323 A.D.

Assigns the construction of a mosque
 to Sha'ban, son of Hasan, the Mushrif
 of the Farrashes and Gumashta of
 Jalor.

E.I.M., 1949-50, p. 32, pl. XV b;
A.R.I.E., 1966-67, No. D. 191.

35. Udaipur

A.H.

Assigns the construction of some
 structure to Malik Asadud-Din Arsalan

E.I.A.P.S., 1935-56, p. 67, pl. XVII a;
A.R.I.E., 1952-53, No. C, III.

1	2	3
---	---	---

36. Tordi

A.H.Jumada I

Fragmentary. Assigns the construction of some structure to Malik Asadu'd-Din Arsalan.

E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, p. 67, pl. XVII a;
A.R.I.E., 1952-53, No. c. III.

37. Nagaur

Extent portion only refers to the reign of the king and gives his name and titles.

E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 11, pl. III a;
A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 343.

38. Bari Kahatu

Fragmentary refers to the the excavation and construction of the tank called Firuz Saghar (Sagar) during the governorship of Maliku'l-Umara Firuz (son of) Muhammad, chief Superintendent (Shahmabek) of the 'Paigah-i-Khass-i-qadim' and Muqti of (name lost). Also mentions Khalafu'l-Muluk Tajud-Daulat Wa'd-Din (name lost).

E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 9, pl. II a;
A.R.I.E., 1962-63, No. D. 194.

39. Chittorgarh

A.H.755, Shawwal 9=Sept.18,1325 A.D.

Records the construction of an inn called 'Sultan Sarai' at Khidrabad (i.e. Chittorgarh) by Malik Asadu'd-Din, the governor.

E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, p. 70,
pl. XVII b; A.R.I.E., 1955-56,
No. D. 127.

- E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 19, pl. IV b;
A.R.I.E., 1961-62, No. D. 245;
A.S.I., XIII, pp. 64-69.

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 44. Bari Khatu | <p>Extent portion contains part of the name of the king and of an official.</p> <p><u>E.I.A.P.S.</u>, 1967, p. 20, pl. IV a;
 <u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1962-63, No. D. 204.</p> |
| 45. Loharpura | <p>A.H. 745 (words), Safar = June-July, 1344 A.D.</p> <p>Damaged. Records the date of the death of (name illegible).</p> <p><u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1965-66, No. D. 358.</p> |
| 46. Standa | <p>A.H. 745, Shawwal 1 = February 5, 1345 A.D.</p> <p>Registers the death of Shaikh Da'ud-Thabit Afghan.</p> <p><u>E.I.A.P.S.</u>, 1953, and 1954, p. 18, pl. V c; <u>A.R.I.E.</u> 1952-53, No. C.106.</p> |
| 47. Nagaur | <p>A.H. 761=1359-60 A.D.</p> <p>Records the construction of a mosque.</p> <p><u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1965-66, No. D. 337.</p> |
| 48. Bari Khatu | <p>A.H. 761, Shawwal, 1 = August 15, 1360 A.D.</p> <p>Damaged. States that these six martyrs were killed on the 1d day after displaying great valour.</p> <p><u>A.R.I.E.</u>, 1962-63, No. D. 205.</p> |

- A.H. 765, Rab1'I, 1-Dec.8, 1363 A.D.

E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 57-58,
pl. XV a; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No.
D. 136 and 1956-57, No. B. 478.

- A.H. 772, 211 Qa'da 27 = June 12,
1371 A.D.

E.I.M., 1949-50, p. 19, pl. IX a;
A.R.I.E., 1968-69, No. D.

- A.H. 779, Muharram 10 = May
19, 1377 A.D.

E.I.M., 1949-50, p. 19, pl. XX b;
A.R.I.E., 1969-70, No. D. 145.

1	2	3
---	---	---

56. Midwana

A.H. 786, Rabi I, 24 = May
16, 1384 A.D.Records the construction of a mosque
by Kabir, son of Khwajagi, son of
Minhaj an-Nasibi.E.I.H., 1949-50, p. 20, pl. X b;
A.R.I.E., 1969-70, No. D. 134.

57. Mandor

Records the construction of a mosque.

E.I.A.P.S., 1967, p. 23, pl. V b;
A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 156.

58. Hindaun

A.H. 791, Shaban 6, Friday
(night) = July 31, 1389 A.D.Records the death of the wife
of Bir Khan Turmati.A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 168.

59. Nagaur

A.H. 791, Muharram 20 (?),
Tuesday = January 19, 1389 A.D.Records that this is the grave of
the magnificent noble-man, Malik
Qutbu'd-Din Najm, the Deputy (na'ib)
i.e. governor of the Shiq (i.e.
division) of Nagaur and Jalor. Also
states that he attained martyrdom
after mid-day prayers on the date
quoted while fighting in the army
of the Muslims in the path of God.A.R.I.E., 1969-70, No. D. 167.

- A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 340.**

.....
 1 2 3

64. Bahrer
 (Alwar)

A.H. 842, Sha'ban 1 = January
 17, 1439 A.D.; A.H. 846, Rajab =
 November-December, 1442 A.D.

States that the construction of the
 Step-well was commenced on the first
 date and completed on the second
 date in the time of the great Khan,
 Mubarak Khan (son of) Alam Khan, son
 of Qasim (?) Khan al-Ahrari (?) by
 Abu'l-Laith Nasr son of Mughith al-
 Lahori, known as (illegible), one of
 the Servants of Hadrat Makhdum Shaikh
 Fadlu'llah Bukhari.

A.R.I.E., 1965-66, No. D. 309.

65. Tordi
 (Jaipur)

A.H. 852 (?), Muharram 16 =
 March 22, 1448 A.D.

Seems to assign the construction of
 the well to Diwani Miyah (?).
 Written by Maulana Ahmad 'Amid Shah
 (?) Nagauri.

E.I.N., 1923-24, p. 24, pl. XI a.

66. Bayana

A.H. 854, Ranzan 8 =
 October 16, 1450 A.D.

Records the death of Maliku'sh-Sharq
 Malik Badr Miyan.

A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 118.

Lodia:

67. Bayana

A.H. 869, Jumadi II, Tuesday 8
 January-February, 1465 A.D.

Records the death of His Holiness
 Shaikh Sadrud-Din. Further mentions
 one Amir Ghiyath (son of ?) Mahmud.

A.R.I.E., 1955-56, No. D. 116.

1	2	3
---	---	---

68. Alwar

A.H. 888, Muharram = February -
March, 1483 A.D.

Damaged. Mentions that the fort and the gate of the qasba of Naugenwan which had fallen in ruins were reconstructed during the governorship of Masnad-i-Ali 'Alvali Khan by Jalal, son of Zakarriya son of Ahmad, son of Jalal.

E.I.A.P.S., 1955, p. 53, pl. XIV d;
A.R.I.E., 1952-53, No. c. 98.

69. Naugenwan
(Alwar)

A.H. 888, Muharram = February -
March 1483 A.D.

Damaged. Mentions that the fort and the gate of the qasba of Naugenwan which reconstructed during the governorship of Masnad-i-Ali 'Alwal Khan, by Jalal, son of Zakarriya, son of Ahmad, son of Jalal.

E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, p. 53, pl. XIV d;
A.R.I.E., 1952-53, No. C. 98.

70. Kumhari
(Nagaur)

A.H. 902 (?) = 1496-97 A.D.

Seems to refer to the construction of the mosque, tomb and garden of the late Khan Firus Khan.

A.R.I.E., 1961-62, No. D. 243.

71. Bijaimandirgarh

A.H. 902, Ramzan 8 = May 10, 1947 A.D.

Records the construction of a step-well inside the fort.

A.S.I., XX, p. 87.

- Records the construction of a dome by 'Alam Khan, son of Mujahid Khan, the mugti. Also designates the fort as Islamabad.

A.R.I.E., 1963-64, No. D. 314.;
A.S.I., XX, p. 91, pl. XIX.

- Records the construction of a minaret under the supervision of Nizam Khan Mujahid Khan.

A.S.I., XX, pp. 73-74.

B: LIST OF SANSKRIT INSCRIPTIONS
(containing references to
muslims)

1 2 3

1. Dholpur V.S. 898
First epigraphic reference to the term Mischchha in Rajasthan.
Bhandarkar's List No. 27; text, published by R.C. Aggarwal, Hazari Lal Sariti Grantha, (Bilavar, 1965), pp. 666-68.
2. Kiradu (Jodhpur) V.S. 1235
Reference to Turushka.
Noticed, D.R. Bhandarkar, P.R. (W.C.), 1906-07, p. 42.
3. Manglena V.S. 1272
' ... Surtrana Mahamada ... '
text, pt. Ram Karna, I.A., Vol. XLI (41), April, 1912, pp. 87-88.
4. Raghunathgarh (Sikar) V.S. 1283
' ... Surtrana Mahamada ... '
Noticed, A.R.I.E., 1960-61.
5. Sunda Hill (Jodhpur) V.S. 1319
F. Kielhorn, E.I., Vol. IX, pp. 62-83; Bhandarkar's List, No. 561.

.....
 1 2 3

12. Ladnu
 (Jodhpur)

V.S. 1373

'... Shaka ... bhupa Sahabudina ...
 kutvu-dina Shakaisha ... shamsadina ...
 Ghyas dina ... Perojasahi ... Sarad
 dina ... bhupa sri Mauja dina ...
 Alavadina nripati ... bhuvi mahan
 Alavadina upma sanjato no pura na
 chasti bhavita na agre shakaisha
 kachit ... Kutvadina ...'

Ed. Pt. Ram Karna, E.I., Vol. XII,
 (1913-14), pp. 17-27; Bhandarkar's
List, No. 672.

13. Ajmer

V.S. 1373

Mentions Maharaja Shri Khadar
 Malik. Purport not clear.

Noticed, A.R.I.E., 1957-58, p. 60.

14. Mt. Abu

V.S. 1377

The inscription states that when the
Asuras destroyed the Kshatriyas he
 (Lavanyakarna) devoted himself to the
 protection of his clansmen and their
 lads.

G.H.Ojha's, transcription quoted and
 summarised by Dashratha Sharma,
E.C.D., p. 176 and 177-78. cf. Wilson,
Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI, p. 234
 and Bhandarkar's List, No. 676.

15. Dantidurg
 (Sikar)

V.S. 1382.

Reference to Raja Mahamada Sahi.

Noticed A.R.I.E., 1959-60, p. 104.

1	2	3
---	---	---

16. Revasa
(Jaipur)

V.S. 1382

'When king Mahamada Sahi was reigning, one thakkura Vichchaja, son of thakkura Daipati of the Lohatani family rebuilt the temple of Jini'

Noticed A.R. (W.C.), 1909-10, p. 52; Bhandarkar's List, No. 681.

17. Naraina

V.S. 1384

Eulogises Sultan Muhammad Tughluq as the crest jewel among the other rulers.

Ed. J. Vogel, Catalogue of the Delhi Museum of Archaeology, Calcutta, 1908, pp. 30-32; Agha Mahdi Husain, Tughluq Dynasty, pp. 324-28.

18. Parbatsar
(Nagaur)

V.S. 1389

'...Maharajadhiraja paramabhattacharaka Surtrana Mahamada Sahi ...'

Noticed, I.A.A.R., 1965-66, p. 14.

19. Amber
(Jaipur)

V.S. 1419

Reference to Sultan Firuz Tughluq.

Ed. Y.K. Bukhari, E.I.A.P.S., 1955-56, pp. 57-58; A.R.I.E., 1955-56, p. 72.

20. Dhigvara

V.S. 1421

Reference to Surtrana Peroja Sahi.

Bhandarkar's List, No. 712.

1	2	3
---	---	---

27. Kolu
(Jodhpur) V.S. 1483
Mention of one Lava (?) Khana
Bhandarkar's List, No. 759.
28. Chittorgarh V.S. 1485
'... Shakadhipa ... Peroja ...
Yavanavnarapati etc.' (also
mentions that Mokal defeated Peroja,
the king of the Yavanas).
Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 614-15,
fn. 2; Bhandarkar's List, No. 764.
29. Shringirishi
(Chittorgarh) V.S. 1485
Mention of Patishah, Alaud-Din
Khalji and the term Yavna.
Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 557, fn. 3.
30. Sadadi
(Ranakpur temple)
Jodhpur. V.S. 1496
Mentions of Alavadina Surtrana
and Mlechchha Mahipala.
Noticed, Ojha, Rajputana Museum
Report, Ajmer, 1920-21, p. 4; For
full text see Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod,
Vol. I, pp. 409-10, and P.C.Nahar,
J.L.S., Vol. I, pp. 165-66.
31. Jaisalmer V.S. 1497
Mention of Mlechchha.
C.M.J.B., Appdx. I, p. 66;
Bhandarkar's List, No. 787.

1	2	3
---	---	---

32. Bayana V.S. 1503
'... Sri Muhammad Khan rajye
vartmane ...'.
Cunningham, A.S.I., Vol. XX, p. 78.
33. Chittorgarh V.S. 1505
Rana Kumbha defeated the combined
forces of Gurjara, Malwa and the
Surtrana.
Bhandarkar's List, No. 797; Cf.
Kirtistambha inscription of V.S. 1517,
G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 617, fn. 2.
34. Macheri V.S. 1515
Mention of Sultan Bahlul Lodi
Noticed, G.H.Ojha, P.R.(W.C.), 1918-19,
p. 3; Carlile, A.S.I., Vol. VI,
p. 81; Bhandarkar's List, No. 821.
35. Kumbhalgarh V.S. 1517
'... Peroja Shahi ... Mlechchha ...
and Shaka etc. ...'.
G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, p. 586,
fn. 2; Shymal Das, Vir-Vinod, Vol. I,
pp. 411, fn.
36. Chittorgarh V.S. 1517
(Kirtistambha)
Mention of Surtrana.
G.H.Ojha, U.R.I., Vol. I, pp. 565-66,
fn. 4; D.R. Bhandarkar's List,
No. 796.

- ●●●
●

BIBLIOGRAPHYPERSIAN SOURCES (Original)

- Abdullah Tarikh-i-Daudi, Aligarh Text.
- Abdul Baqi Nihawandi Maasir-i-Rahimi, Vol. I, Ed. M. Hidayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1924.
- Abul Fasl Ain-i-Akbari, 2 Vols. Ed. Blochman, Calcutta, 1867-68.
- Amir Khusrau (a) Dawal Rani Khizr Khan, completed 715 A.H./A.D., 1316. Aligarh text.
- (b) Khazain-ul-Futuh, completed 711 A.H./A.D. 1311-12. Aligarh text.
- (c) Miftah-ul-Futuh, completed 690 A.H./A.D. 1291. Aligarh text.
- (d) Tughluq Nama, composed A.H. 720/A.D. 1320. Ed. S.H. Faridabadi, Hyderabad Deccan, 1933.
- Ahmed Yadgar Tarikh-i-Salatin-i-Afghana, or Tarikh-i-Shahi, Ed. M. Hidayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1839.
- Afif Shams-i-Siraj Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi, Ed. Wilayat Husain, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1891.
- Badauni, Abul Qadir Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh, completed, A.H. /696 A.D. Ed. Maulavi Ahmad Ali, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1868.

- Barani, Ziaud-Din** Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi,
completed A.H. /1369 A.D.
(a) Bibl. Ind. Text, 1862
Calcutta,
(b) Aligarh text, 2 Vols.,
(incomplete).
- Fakhrud-Din Mubarak** Tarikh-i-Fakhrud-Din Mubarak,
or Fakhr-i-Mulbir,
(a) ed. Sir Denison Ross,
London, 1927.
(b) Aligarh Rotograph.
- Ferishta, Muhammad
Qasim-Hindu Beg** Tarikh-i-Ferishta,
completed A.H. /1612 A.D.
Lithograph Edition, Naval
Kishor Press, Lucknow, 1864.
- Ibn Batuta** Kitabur-Rehla,
~~completed towards the middle~~
of 14th century A.D.
- Isami (Pen Name)** Futuh-us-Salatin,
completed A.H. /1350 A.D.
Ed. S.Usha, Madras
- Mushtaqi Risquallah** Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi,
Aligarh Rotograph.
- Nizami, Hasan** Tajul Maasir, Mss. copy of
Prof. Muhammad Habib.
Completed A.H. 626/1228 A.D.
- Siraj, Minhajud-Din** Tabqat-i-Nasiri, 2 Vols.
completed A.H. 658/1260 A.D.,
Kabul text.
- Sirhindi, Yahya bin Ahmad** Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi,
completed A.H. 837/1434 A.D.,
ed. M.Hidayat Hussain, Bibl.
Ind. Calcutta, 1931.

Nisamatullah, Khwaja

Tarikh-i-Khan-i-Jahant wa
Makhzan-i-Afghana, Vol. I,
Karachi.

Nizamud-Din Ahmad

Tabqat-i-Akbari, Vol. I,
written A.H. /1593 A.D.,
Ed. B. Dey, Bib. Ind.
Calcutta, 1927.

PERSIAN SOURCES
Translations etc.

Bayley, E.C.

Mirat-i-Sikandari, of
Sikandar Mahmud Majnu,
English tr., London, 1886.

Basu, K.K.

Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi,
of Sirhindi, Yahya bin Ahmad
(a) English tr., Baroda Or.
Institute, 1932.

(b) Hindi tr., Sayyid Athar
Abbad Rizvi.

Beveridge (Mrs. A.S.)

Tuzak-i-Babari or Babar Nama,
by Babar, tr. from Original
Turki, Vols. I, II, London.

Beveridge, H.

Akbar Nama by Abul Fasl,
Calcutta, 1910.

Blochman

Ain-i-Akbari, English tr., 1927.

Briggs (J)

Tarikh-i-Perishta,
(a) English tr. Bib. Ind.
Calcutta, 1913.
(b) Hindi tr., S.A.A. Rizvi.

Dorn

Makhzan-i-Afghana, tr.,
'History of Afghans', 1st
Vol. Committee, London,
1829-36, Reprinted.

Elliot and Dowson

History of India as told by
its own historians, Vols.
II, III and IV.

- Fuller (Major A.R.) Tarikh-i-Perozzshahi,
extracts translated in Eng.,
Journal of Asiatic Society
of Bengal.
- Habib, Prof. Muhammad Khazain ul Futuh, Eng. tr.,
'Treasurers of Victory',
Madras, 1931.
- Habib, Prof. Muhammad Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni,
Delhi Reprint, 1967.
- Husain, Agha Mahdi Rehla or Travells of Ibn
Batuta, Eng. tr., Baroda, 1953.
- Malet, (C.C) Tarikh-i-Masumi, of Mir
Masum, Eng. tr., Bombay, 1855.
- Ranking, G. Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh of
Badauni, Vol. II, Calcutta,
1897-1924.
- Sayid Husain. Tughluq Namah,
'Islamic Culture,' Vol. VII,
p. 301.

SANSKRIT (Original)

- Anonymous Puratanprabandhasangrah,
composed about V.S. 1528
(some portions are believed
to have been written as early
as V.S. 1290. See Introduction
to its edited copy). Ed.
Singhi Jain Grantha Mala,
1936.
- Anonymous Lekhapadhatti,
Ed. C.D. Dalal etc., published
Gaekwad Oriental Series,
Baroda, 1925.
- Chandra Shekar Shurjan Charita,
written during Akbar's period.
(a) Ed. J.B. Chandani, Calcutta,
(b) See also Sharma,
Dashratha, Nagri Precharni
Patrika, Vol. XLVI,
pp. 205-223.

Jaynayak

Prithvirajavijay,
(supposed to be a contemporary
account of Chauhan Prithviraja)
Ed., G.H.Ojha, and C.Guleri,
Ajmer, 1941.

Jainapala

Khartaragachchhapattavali,
(a) Singhi Jain Grantha Mala,
Bombay.

(b) Summarised by Prof.
Dashratha Sharma, I.H.Q.,
Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 223.

Merutungacharya

Prabandhasointamani,
composed V.S. 1361. Singhi
Jain Grantha Mala, 1933.

Rajashekhara

Prabandhakosha,
composed, V.S. 1405. Singhi
Jaina Grantha Mala, 1935.

Suri, Jaysingha

Hammiramadmardana,
published Gaskell Oriental,
series No. X, 1920.

Suri, Jinprabha

Vividhatirthakalpa,
Ed. and published: Singhi
Jain Grantha Mala, 1934.
See also Indian Antiquary,
1897, pp. 194-95.

Suri, Nayachandra

Hammiramahakavya,
(a) Ed. Rajasthan Ort. Res.
Inst, Jodhpur.
(b) English tr., by J.Kirtani,
Ind. Anti., 1879, pp.

Thakur Vidyapati

Purushapariksha,
tr., Grierson, Test of
Man, London, 1935.

RAJASTHANI AND HINDI

Anonymous

Viren De Sonigara Ki Bat,
Ed., Rajasthan Ort. Res.
Institute, Jodhpur.

Anonymous

Gora Badal Kavit,
ed. by B.L.Nahata, in Padmini
Charitra Chaupai, Bikaner,
V.S. 2018, pp. 109-128.

Bhandav Vyasa

Hammira Deo Chaupai,
written V.S. 1638/1481 A.D.,
Mss. noticed by Shri Agar
Chand Nahata in Maru Bharati,
Vol. IV, prt. 11, pp. 44, ff.
~~xxxxxx~~ Ed. Sadul Rajasthani
Res. Institute, Bikaner.

Chandarashekhara

Hammira Hatha,
completed V.S. 1902
Nagri Pracharni Sabha,
Benaras.

Dalpat (Daulat) Vijay

Khoman Raso,
extracts about Padmini edited
by B.L.Nahata in Padmini
Charitra Chaupai, Sadul
Rajasthani Research Institute,
Bikaner, V.S. 2018, pp. 129-181.

Gval Kavi

Hammira Hatha,
composed V.S. 1883
(Identical with Chandara-
Shekhar's Hammira Hatha).

Jayasi, Malik Muhammad

Padmavat,
composed A.D. 1540, ed.
V.S. Aggarwal.

Jodhraja

Hammira Raso,
composed V.S. 1885/ 1829 A.D.
ed. Nagri Pracharni Sabha,
Benaras, 1929.

Khem Bhat

Raja Hammir De Kavir,
written V.S. 1706, ed. by
B.L.Nahata, in Hammiraya,
Appendix IV, Bikaner,
V.S. 2017.

Labdhodaya

Padmini Charitra Chaupai,
composed V.S. 1705-1707,
ed. B.L.Nahata, Sadul
Rajasthan Research Institute,
Bikaner, V.S. 2018.

Mahesh

Hammira Raso,
Two Mss. copies with Shri
Agra Chand Nahata, Bikaner.

Nainsi

Nainsi Khyat,
written about the middle
of 17th century.
(a) Text, ed. Rajasthan
Ort., Res. Inst, Jodhpur.

(b) Hindi tr., R.N.Dugar,
Nagri Pracharni Sabha,
Banaras.

Nahar, Jatma

Gora Badal Chaupai,
composed V.S. 1680, text,
ed. by B.L.Nahata in Padmini
Charitra Chaupai, Bikaner,
V.S. 2018, pp. 182-208.

Padmanabha

Kanhada De Prabandha,
written V.S. 1512/ 1456 A.D.,
(a) ed. K.B.Vyas, Jaipur, 1963.

(b) See also Dashratha Sharma,
Shodhapatrika, Udaipur,
Vol. III, prt. 1.

Rajarupa

Hammira Ra Chanda,
composed V.S. 1798/ 1742 A.D.
Mss. Sri Anup Sanskrit
Library, Bikaner.

Surya Mal

Vansabhaskar

Vajpaye, Chandar Shekhar

HammirahathaMODERN WORKSENGLISH

Ahluwalia, M.S.

Studies in Medieval Rajasthan,
Delhi, 1970.

Aitekar, A.S.

Rashtrakutas and their Times,
Poona, 1934.

Banerjee, J.M.

History of Feroz Tughluq,
Delhi, 1967.

Banerjee, R.D.

The Palas of Bengal, *Bombay, 1934.*

Basu, K.K.

Khalji Imperialism,

Bayley, E.C.

History of Gujarat, *Delhi reprint, 1970*

Bose, N.S.

History of the Chandellas,
Calcutta, 1956.

Chaudhary, G.C.

Political History of Northern
India, Amritsar, 1963.

Cunningham

Archaeological Survey of
India Reports, Vol. XX,
Reprinted.

Day, U.N.

Medieval Malwa,
Delhi, 1965.

- Forbes, A.K. Rasamala, 2 Vols.
- Gangauli, D.C. History of Paramaras of Malwa, Dacca, 1933.
- Haig, Sir. W. Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, London, 1935.
- Haq, S.M. Barani's History of the Tughluq's, Pakistan Historical Society, Karachi.
- Hodivala, S.H. Studies in Indo Moslem History, Bombay, 1939.
- Habibullah, A.B.M. Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, Mumukshu Bhawan, Lahore, 1945, reprint.
- Husain, Agha Mahdi Life and times of Muhammad bin Tughluq, London, 1938.
- Ibid. Tughluq Dynasty, Calcutta, 1963.
- Jauhari, R.C. Feroz Tughluq, Agsa, 1968.
- Lal, K.S. History of the Khaljis, Allahabad, 1950.
- Lal, K.S. Twilight of the Sultanate, Delhi, 1963.
- Majumdar, A.K. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, Bombay, 1956.
- Mirza, Wahid Life and Works of Amir Khusräu, Calcutta, 1932.
- Misra, V.C. Geography of Rajasthan, Delhi, 1967.
- Mishra, V.B. The Gurjara Pratiharas and their Times, Bombay, 1966.

- Moulond, W.H. Agrarian System of Muslim India, Allahabad, 1929.
- Munshi, K.M. The Glory that was Gurjaradesa, The History of Gurjara Pratihara (ed.) History and Culture of Indian People, Vols. IV and V., Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay.
- Nasim, M. Life and Time of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna, Cambridge, 1931.
- Nizam, S.B.P. Nobility under the Sultans of Delhi, Delhi, 1970.
- Niyogi, R. History of the Gahadwala Dynasty, Calcutta, 1959.
- Pandey, A.B. First Afghan Empire in India, Calcutta, 1956.
- Prasad, Ishwari History of Qasimab Turks in India, Allahabad, 1936.
- Qanungo, K.R. Studies in Rajput History, Delhi, 1960.
- Ray, H.C. Dynastic History of Northern India, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931-36.
- Reu, B.N. Glories of Marwar and Glorious Rathors, Jodhpur, 1943.
- Reu, B.N. Marwar ka Itihas, Jodhpur, 1938.
- Saran, P. Studies in Medieval Indian History, Delhi, 1962.
- Sen, A.K. People and Politics in Early Medieval India, Calcutta, 1963.
- Sharda, H.B. Hammira of Ranthambhor Maharana Kumbha Maharana Sangha, Delhi, 1970.

- Sharma, Dashratha Early Chauhan Dynasties,
Delhi, 1959.
- Sharma, R.S. Rajasthan through Ages, (ed.)
Vol. I, Bikaner, 1968.
- Sirkar, D.C. Indian Feudalism,
Calcutta, 1965.
- Spate, O.H.K. and Indian Epigraphy
Learmouth, A.T.A. India and Pakistan,
Bungay, Suffolk, 1967.
- Thomas, Edwards Chronicles of the Pathan
Kings of Delhi, Delhi, 1967.
(Indian Edition).
- Tod, Col. James. Annals and Antiquities of
Rajasthan, 3 Vols., ed. by
Crook's. Oxford, 1920.
- Tripathi History of Kanauj,
Delhi, 1964.
- Upadhyay, V. Socio-Religious Condition
of North India, Varanasi,
1964.
- Wright, Nelson Coins and Metrology of the
Sultans of Delhi,
Delhi, 1936.

JOURNALS, PERIODICALS AND REPORTS ETC.

Annual Report of Indian Epigraphy.

Archaeological Survey of India Reports.

Archaeological Survey Reports - Rajputana Museum.

Archaeological Survey Reports - Western Circle.

Census of India - Reports.

Epigraphia Indica-Arabic and Persian Supplement.

Epigraphia Indica

Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.

Indian Epigraphy - A Review.

Indian Historical Quarterly.

Journal of Indian History.

Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal.

**Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of
G.K. and Ireland.**

Proceedings of Indian History Congress.

Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress.